The PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

Its Origin, Organization and Influence

JOHN J. RICE

BX
8935
.R5
1929

4.26.37

Library of The Theological Seminary

PRINCETON · NEW JERSEY

PRESENTED BY

Princeton University Library

BX 8935 .R5 1929
Rice, John J.
The Presbyterian Church

The Presbyterian Church

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
APR 26 1937
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

The PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

Its Origin, Organization and Influence

by

JOHN J. RICE

Published by
PRESBYTERIAN COMMITTEE *of* PUBLICATION
RICHMOND, VA., TEXARKANA, ARK.-TEX

958

COPYRIGHT, 1929
PRESBYTERIAN COMMITTEE *of* PUBLICATION
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

PRESS OF WHITTET & SHEPPERSON, RICHMOND, VA.
1927—(1)—2098

Foreword

The object of this book is to present a brief description of the origin, government, influence and contribution of the great Presbyterian Church to the life of the world and the United States of America. It has been written for busy people whose time for reading is limited by the demands of this rushing age. The facts are calculated to inform the reader, arouse feelings of thanksgiving, and deepen church loyalty. In its long career the Presbyterian Church has passed through many experiences and many interesting and glorious things have gathered around it. These pages contain only a small part of the story.

The articles contained in this volume originally appeared in the *Observer* and are issued with slight changes.

JOHN J. RICE.

Danville
Kentucky.

Contents

PAGE

FOREWORD 5

I. THE ADVANTAGES OF A CREED 9

II. OUR NAME AND FORM OF GOVERNMENT DIRECTLY FROM THE BIBLE 24

III. THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH AND THE REFORMATION 38

IV. JOHN CALVIN, FOUNDER OF LIBERTY 54

V. CALVIN, THE FOUNDER OF REPUBLICS 66

VI. THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY WROTE OUR CREED 75

VII. THE PRESBYTERIANS WHO CAME TO AMERICA 86

VIII. THE PRESBYTERIANS WHO CAME TO AMERICA—CONCLUDED 96

IX. THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN COLONIAL DAYS 106

X. THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH AND THE REVOLUTION 115

XI. THIRTY-FIVE REASONS WHY I PREFER THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH 130

Chapter I

The Advantages of a Creed

We have noticed that few, if any, of our Presbyterian church historians begin by presenting the important fact that our Church is based upon a written creed, and yet it seems to the writer that some vital things are to be gained by beginning in this way.

The Presbyterian Church has been severely criticised by unscholarly people who have not thought deeply enough into church history to understand it. It is surprising to meet now and then one who will say: "I regard the Presbyterian Church highly but I do not like the idea of a written creed." These objectors may be divided into three classes:

(1) Those who take this criticism from the lips of others and do not know enough of the history of the Christian Church to discern whether creeds are an advantage or not. Even the ministers in creedless churches who speak as we have indicated usually have made little effort to discover the benefits of creeds.

(2) There are those who do not believe very strongly that the Bible is God's inspired Word to men and want to make a composite religion to include all men. The creeds are clear-cut statements of Christian beliefs and thus are in their way. These objectors to a creed believe in annexing people rather than in converting people. They would make the Christian religion so wide and at the same time so weak that none would object to any of its teachings, and then proceed to annex Jews, Buddhists, Confucianists,

Hindus, Mohammedans, Unitarians, Deists and every sect known. But Jesus sent His apostles out not to annex men but to convert men.

(3) There are a few learned people who object to creeds on conscientious grounds. But judging this matter as one to be debated, let the reader of these words realize that those who favor creeds have the stronger argument on their side. This argument we will indicate in the following discussion. It is of interest to Presbyterians because their great Church has a creed.

The objectors to creeds often find fault with certain doctrines in the creed. The creedal statements on such subjects as the Decrees of God, Original Sin, Foreknowledge and Predestination are often harshly criticised. But I would always answer such objectors with the words: "You get the proof-texts for these things out of the Bible, and then we will get these articles out of our creed."

The Advantages of a Creed

Every one whether willing to admit it or not has a religious creed of some kind. It may be long or short, scholarly or unscholarly, biblical or unbiblical. But every one whether they know it or not has a religious creed. If a person has no creed it is an indication of mental weakness.

The word creed comes from the Latin word "credo" which means "I believe." Thus a creed is a statement of what one believes. Every one believes and so we may say every one has a creed. Thinking people form conclusions and these are beliefs. It is inevitable that those who do not have beliefs have done precious little thinking..

But every one may not have a written creed. Some prefer to take the New Testament alone as their creed. But even then they adopt very decided beliefs on some subjects. For instance a Church may adopt the New Testament as its creed and hold that immersion alone is the proper mode of baptism, and that only adults should be received into church membership. Thus this Church forms a creed on baptism and church membership.

When such facts are mentioned members of these churches will point out that their creed is very short. But a short creed has its disadvantages, for a short creed always takes in a limited part of the Bible. This makes peope of limited Bible knowledge. Presbyterians think the Old Testament and the New Testament are great books and worthy of deep study, and that the creed should be commensurate with the body of revelation.

Some prefer a short creed because they are afraid of certain parts of the Bible. They are, what we would be warranted in calling, Bible cowards. They are afraid of parts of the Old Testament and parts of the New Testament. But Presbyterians believe they can trust the Old Testament and the New Testament writers and Jesus Christ in all that they have said for our guidance and encouragement. We do not want to put the blindfold over our eyes or stop our ears with wax. Some truths may be unpleasant but we prefer to see and hear them with the hope that eternity will not surprise us.

For instance, it would be unfortunate not to believe in hell and teach men to disregard it and then awake in eternity and find a hell there, and realize that although saved ourselves we have taught others to be careless and thus contributed to their ruin. So Presbyterians think we

should pause reverently before the Bible, look at it from beginning to end, and listen to every truth declared. Some would say, "Oh, we are not afraid of God." Our reply would be that neither are we afraid of Him, but we are afraid of the consequences of sin, and sin is here, and God is just as well as kind.

Again the advocates of one creedless Church sometimes say that they are warranted in their practice on baptism and adult church membership because they have for these things the authority of church history. But this answer will not do. Church history is not at all conclusive on the mode of baptism, and on adult membership it strongly supports infant baptism.

Advantages

I prefer a written creed because it tells me what learned men think the Bible teaches. A creed is a creation of the intellect. As men think, they develop creeds. The creeds are written summaries of religious conclusions. The men who wrote our creed were of great mental ability. I am not so certain of my own ability to interpret the New Testament correctly, and I desire the guidance of great minds who have reverently and through long years studied the book. Let me take what they have to say and compare it with the Bible, and if I find that they are wrong then I do not have to be in their Church. I can leave the Presbyterian Church and join another. We Presbyterians are confident that the Bible verses sustain our creed, and so we give it to all for their guidance.

Those who join our Church are not asked to subscribe to the creed. They are not even questioned about it. We

do not find it either a cramp or a detriment, but an advantage.

It Enables Us to Teach Our People

A creed helps us to teach Bible truth to our people. It gives us a clear, concise statement of Bible religion to proceed by. It is often said that Presbyterians are strong Christians. This is because we use the creed as a guide and teach our people the Bible, the whole Bible, and teach them not to fear or disregard any part of it, but to love it all and obey it all. It has its mysteries, of course, but God's ways and thoughts are higher than ours, and eternity will explain all.

The Catechism

The Catechism is a part of our creed. The ancient Jews knew the importance of catechetical instruction and put catechetical Bible schools in all their synagogues. In Tiberius there were sixteen of these schools. Jerusalem had more than four hundred. Some say four hundred and sixty, and others put the number at four hundred and eighty. Josephus claimed that the catechetical schools had existed from the days of Moses. These schools were in the churches of the Apostles in New Testament times. An institution called the Catechumenate was established early in the history of the Church, and "when any of the surrounding pagans wished to come into the Church they were first placed in those classes, and, as a rule, kept there for two or three years; and often the best talent of the Church was employed to give them instruction."

In the Dark Ages this method of teaching, as well as all others, disappeared. Those ages became dark for this reason. When the Reformation came, this method of instruction was revived. All the reformers wrote Catchisms. There were twelve or fourteen men in the Westminster Assembly of Divines who had written Catechisms. (These thoughts are fully treated in that splendid pamphlet by Dr. G. B. Strickler entitled: "The Nature, Value and Special Utility of the Catechisms.")

The Roman Catholic Council of Trent said that heretics had made use of Catechisms as the chief means of corrupting Christians. In the thirteenth century the Roman Catholic Church sent an ambassador to see what could be done to win the Waldensians to the Catholic faith. He reported on his return that by catechetical schools the people had been grounded in their faith and that they could not be shaken.

The Catechisms contain all the essential truths of the Gospel. Not only do they contain all essential truths but they have them in accurate form. "Another excellence that our Catechisms possess is that they not only thus state the essential truths of religion with marvelous accuracy, but they so state them, that, while expressing them clearly in positive form, they at the same time negatively, at every point, guard against the most serious errors by which at those points they have been assailed." A fourth point in favor of these Catechisms is that they present the doctrines in the right and logical order.

There is not one person in a hundred that can give an adequate definition of God unless they quote a creedal definition. The only other way would be to quote a large number of verses that tell about Him, and such a defini-

tion would lack the simplicity and unity that rhetoricians earnestly call for.

Another noteworthy thing about our creed, and one that its objectors have disregarded, is that the creed gives the objectionable doctrines such a place as is commensurate with the space they occupy in the Old and New Testaments. It is also true that our preachers and Sunday school teachers do not stress these doctrines beyond the emphasis the Scriptures place upon them.

Some of those who object to creeds have not realized that any doctrine may be made detrimental by overemphasis. The Mode of Baptism, the Second Coming of Christ, the Holiness Doctrine, Faith, Works, Love—any one of these may be preached to the disregard of the others, until it makes fanatical and lop-sided Christians. The person who emphasizes any one of these will become a crank. A creed prevents this distortion. We know of one Church that has preached so much about the mode of baptism and works, to the disregard of other important things, that that Church has become in many places a mere club or society and largely Unitarian in belief.

But our creed teaches a symmetrical system of Christian doctrine that prevents people going off at tangents. The Presbyterian Church has fewer fanatics than any other great Church. We do not even have a fanatical feeder whose members become educated and graduate into our Church. The "Hard Shell" Baptists are fanatical, but their children become educated and join the sane, substantial missionary Baptist churches that we love and regard highly. The "Holy Roller" becomes educated, sees the folly of his deception and graduates into a first class Methodist such as we all revere. The man who joins the

Disciples of Christ in a backward community often is misled to believe in Baptismal Regeneration and refuses to permit a piano or musical instrument in the church. But when he becomes better educated he graduates into a first class Disciple. We think that much of the growth of the Churches named may be attributed to the fact that they have fanatical sects that furnish them members.

But the Presbyterian Church has no fanatical sect to send it members. The Gospel is preached as sanely in Presbyterian churches in the back woods as in cities and towns. Perhaps if we could have thundered on Baptismal Regeneration or a Holiness Doctrine our Church would have appealed more to the unlearned who want something pictorial or tangible or highly emotional, and our Church today would be numerically larger. But we have never held these views. We admit cheerfully that the Scriptures contain a Holiness Doctrine but it is not the exaggerated one that has been so often presented. Our creed has kept us near the simple Gospel of Jesus Christ. Let us be thankful for it.

I prefer a creed because the creeds have been a strong influence to keep the creedless churches close to the Evangelical Gospel. This has been admitted by high authorities in creedless churches. It makes us wonder where they might have gone if we had not been on the ground with our written statements of belief. It is our opinion that if men would separate a creedless Christian Church from the wholesome contact with creed Churches, it would drift first into Unitarianism, then to Deism, then to Philosophy. We doubt if it would remain a witness to the evangelical Gospel of Jesus.

It is said that the Roman Catholic Church is a much stronger character builder where it has to compete with Protestantism. The rugged preaching of the latter has actually been a leavening force to make Romanism better. Romanism has had the field alone in South America, and it has become so weak and shot through with sin that good Roman Catholics of this country see its weakness and do not admire it. Small wonder then that the countries of South America are atheistic instead of Christian.

In somewhat the same way the creed Churches influence the Churches without creeds. The creed Church keeps its creedless sister from drifting entirely into a Gospel of Universalism, Unitarianism, or Good Works, or Social Service, or a Society, or a Civic Club. Some of these are good of themselves but they cannot do the work of the Church of Christ. They are below it and not equal to it.

It is not possible to present properly with anything like unanimity Jesus Christ as the Saviour of the World unless a Church has a creed.

"Hastings' Bible Dictionary" contains a long and scholarly article on Jesus Christ. It was written by Prof. W. P. Patterson, D.D., professor of Divinity in the University of Edinburgh. He writes on page 443 as follows: "It is impossible to write about Christ without giving effect to a philosophical and religious creed. . . . There are in fact, as many types of the life of Jesus as there are points of view in theology." He then divides a list of men who have written on the life of Jesus into three classes, and notes the basis, or we may say the creedal view from which they wrote.

I. The first class of writers contains those who eliminated the supernatural element from Jesus. He names three: (1) Paulus, 1828, wrote from the standpoint of eighteenth century Deism. (2) Strauss, 1835, wrote from the position of modern Pantheism. (3) Renan, 1863, wrote from the point of Philosophical Skepticism.

II. The second class of writers contains those who carefully reduced the supernatural elements in the life of Jesus but still adhered to the position of theism. The writer names seven: (1) Seely, 1866; (2) Hase, 1876; (3) Keim, 1867; (4) Holtzman, 1901; (5) Harnack, 1901; (6) J. Weiss, 1892; (7) Bousset, 1906.

III. The third class contains those who reproduced the biblical account as it is understood by the Church. The writer names five: (1) Neander, 1837; (2) B. Weiss, 1882; (3) Edersheim, 1884; (4) Didon, 1891; (5) Sanday, 1906.

The above illustration shows conclusively that our conception of the life of Jesus Christ is controlled by the kind of a creed we believe. It is the opinion of the Presbyterian Church that such conceptions of Jesus as those expressed by the authors in group three are the true ones that God Almighty intended to be given to the world to save mankind.

It is impossible for a Church to be united in belief to any great extent without a creed. Most members of creedless Churches are at sea and do not know what they believe. They may believe in Jesus in a sort of a general way but their faith is usually indefinite. This, of course, is not true of all. But the proportion of those thus afflicted is always large in the creedless Churches. I have known officers in evangelical creedless Churches who did not

even believe in a future life or Heaven or hell. Such is rare. We are glad it is. On the other hand, many of the finest Christians we know are in the creedless Churches. Let it be understood that we are not disregarding the good.

A creed is necessary to a Church that proposes to live through the centuries and conquer. The largest Churches in the world have written creeds. The Roman Catholic Church has six creeds that declare its beliefs. They are: The Apostle's Creed, the Nicean Creed, the Athanasian Creed, the Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent, the Tridentine Confession of Faith, and the Roman Catechism. The strength of this Church that often causes Protestants to marvel is due in a large measure to the clear, bold declarations made in these creeds. The Roman foundation is strong. This Church is confident and unwavering. Recently, His Holiness, the Pope, told a number of churchmen who were interested in church union, that all must come to their creed or not come at all. The Pope believes that his Church has the truth, and that the cause of Jesus Christ cannot be advanced by tempering this truth to suit those who do not agree with it. But Protestants must meet this great Church on the field of the nations. Some of our truths are contrary to those of it. We need a creed to express those truths clearly.

Nations Have Creeds

Our nation is a great one and it has a creed. The Constitution is the governmental creed. The nation could not have lived without it. We are a land of many fraternal orders. Each one has its social or ethical creed. Every

college and university has its creed. It is expressed in the charter or by-laws. It seems illogical to argue against a written creed for Churches.

Our Creed Proved by Texts

I prefer our creed because it is supported by proof-texts from the Bible. It does not contain one single item that is not based on the Old and New Testaments. The creed does not contain a word that was not subjected to the closest scrutiny. Dr. Strickler has written: "Although these Catechisms have been in existence two centuries and a half, and although, for that long period of time, they have been subjected to all the severe and decisive tests of the experiences of the Church, and of the closest scrutiny of her most perfect scholarship, no change in the form of the statement of any one of their great doctrines has ever been made."

Other Bonds of Union

If the Church is not organized on the basis of a creed then some other bond of union must be found. Some suggest that the Church should be organized on a basis of "works." Others suggest the basis of "good will," others the basis of "healing," others that of "human relief," others that of "settlement work." But although these sound plausible, they are not sufficient. Thinking people want and demand a creed based on thought and the Bible and nothing else. There has been many a girl who in her early years cared nothing for the intellectual side of religion. She was religious in her own way, belonged to the church, and did various bits of good work, but cared

nothing at all for the creed. Years passed by. Marriage, the battle of life, business, the home—all came in their time. Then the little child died. She was so young—just three or four years old, so quaint, so loving. In an instant the mother became theological. She asked: "What kind of a God is there?" "Why has He done this?" A mother with a dead baby in her arms is always a theologian. She wants to know something about God. She asks where children go when they die. Then and there she awakens to the value of a creed ("Five Present Day Problems," by Jefferson, page 118). This inquirer will not be satisfied with a Church based on works or good will, but will demand one based on the Revelation of God.

Creeds Written After Serious Thinking

Men often forget that the creeds have been written after periods of serious thinking. They have followed when the intellectual side of religion has been emphasized. Our great creeds all came from the fires of doctrinal controversy, and the definitions given were by learned men who gathered in Councils to consider the points in argument.

The Protestant Reformation came in 1517. At that time men were reading their Bibles as in no previous age. It was a thinking age. Creedal statements of the Christian religion were written in large numbers. In a period of about forty years, beginning with Luther's Catechism in 1528 and closing with the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, about twenty-five Confessions of Faith were written. When 1648 came, the year of the writing of the Westminster Confession of Faith, the writ-

ers had the privilege of studying more than a hundred creeds.

Early Christian Practice

The Presbyterian Church in adopting and using a creed is following in the steps of early Christians. The early Christians formed the habit of reciting the common faith whenever they met. This recitation often assumed a rhythmical form. Thus the early creeds were akin to the hymns and doxology ("Hastings' Bible Dictionary," page 165).

In conclusion it should be borne in mind that our Church adopted its creed because of its great merit. This thing was not forced upon us. It was not crammed down our throats. But we adopted it. The original Synod of our American Presbyterian Church adopted it in 1729. This was eighty-one years after it was written. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in America adopted it in 1788. This was one hundred and forty years after it was written. The Southern Presbyterian Church adopted it in 1861. This was two hundred and thirteen years after it was written. No, it was not forced upon us. Years and years separated us from it. It might be said, we had to look back to find it, and adopted it for its worth, for its excellency, for its grandeur, for its strict adherence to the Word of God. And we hold it reverently, not for one moment on the same plane with the Bible but as a guide to the meanings of the great Book, and as a basis of ecclesiastical fellowship with the aid of which like-minded men and women may labor in harmony.

Questions for Chapter I

1. Name three classes of people that criticize creeds.
2. How can we get rid of creeds?
3. What is the meaning of the word "creed"?
4. State disadvantages of a short creed.
5. What is a Bible coward?
6. State advantages of a written creed.
7. Why should we guard against over-emphasizing special doctrines?
8. What is a fanatical sect?
9. Do nations and lodges have creeds?
10. How have creeds helped creedless churches?
11. Is our creed proved by texts?
12. Was it written after serious thinking?
13. Why did our Church adopt it?

Chapter II

Our Name and Form of Government Directly From the Bible

The Presbyterian Church believes (1) that elders should be duly elected by the people; (2) that all church officials are equal in rank; and (3) in the unity of the Church.

We find the authority for our Form of Government and our system of belief in the Bible. Everything that our Church stands for may be proved by proof-texts from the Old and New Testaments.

It Places Authority in a Board of Elders

The name Presbyterian comes from a Greek word "Presbuteros" that means "elder" or "presbyter." Paul reminded Timothy that he was ordained "with the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery" (I Timothy 4:14). This is important inasmuch as the New Testament writers wrote their books or letters in the Greek language. The Greek word for Presbytery is "Presbuterion" which differs by only two letters from our English word Presbyterian. The word "Presbuteros" occurs in its different forms about seventy times in the New Testament.

The first requirement of the Presbyterian Church is that a local church shall have a body of elders duly elected by the people. The Bible proof-texts for this practice are numerous, and it is not an exaggeration to say that our Form of Government does not hang upon a thread but upon a strong cable of proof that runs through the entire

Bible. This scheme is not the invention of a modern mind that just happened to hit upon it in the search for something reasonable and practical, but one that actually thrusts itself upon all Bible readers.

Let us remember that the world has never been entirely without a knowledge of the ways of God, as faint as this may have been at times. In antiquity He communicated with Adam and his successors and the Bible tells us that Enoch, the seventh from Adam, the son of Jared, and the father of Methuselah, preached of righteousness and judgment to come. But though men had such knowledge it seems that the Church was not established until the time of Abraham (Genesis 12:2-3).

The first form of government among men was patriarchal (Genesis 12:7 and Job 1:5). According to this form the patriarch or elder was the head of the house. After this we must go forward a long time to find elders mentioned again. The search leads to the account of the Burning Bush in Midian. There God told Moses: "Go and gather the elders of Israel together" (Exodus 3:16). In this account Moses was commissioned to lead the Children of Israel out of Egyptian bondage. Thus in these early times the elders were leaders in momentous matters and their co-operation was always necessary to the successful undertaking of important things.

At a later time Moses was ordered to ordain elders to assist him in the government, the tasks of which had become too numerous, heavy and annoying for one person (Exodus 8:21; Numbers 11:16-17). In addition to these particular instances the Bible speaks frequently of el-

ders in the books of Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges and Samuel.

It was the elders who said to God's prophet, Samuel: "Make us a king to judge us like the nations" (I Samuel 8:4-5). God granted the request but He did not approve of it, for He said to Samuel: "They have not rejected thee, but they have rejected Me, that I should not reign over them" (I Samuel 8:7). The elders later adjusted matters with David and made him King. They went into captivity with the people and returned with them. Thus from the very beginning to the very end of the Old Testament the Church was ruled by elders (Ezra 10:14 and 5:5, 9).

When Jesus came, every Jewish Synagogue had its bench of elders (Matthew 21:2-3; Luke 4:20). Of the Synagogue, Archbishop Whately made this significant statement: "It appears probable—I might say morally certain—that wherever a Jewish synagogue was brought in whole or in chief part to embrace the Gospel, the Apostles did not so much form a Christian church as make an existing congregation Christian by introducing the Christian sacraments, leaving the machinery, if I may so speak, of the government unchanged." ("Presbyterianism," a pamphlet by William P. Breed, page 4.)

Paul on his first missionary journey appointed elders in every church (Acts 14:23). The other Apostles did the same (James 5:14; I Peter 5:1). These elders were the bishops or overseers (Acts 20:17, 28; Titus 1:5). They were also the associates of the Apostles in governing the churches (Acts 15:2, 4, 6, 22, 23; 16:4; 21:18). It is also a matter of importance that a local church was not re-

stricted to one elder but often had several elders or bishops, and this argues against the Episcopal form of church government or the superiority of any one church official over another, and for the equality of all (Philippians 1:1; Acts 11:30).

Duties of Elders

The elders had several duties. To them was committed the spiritual care of the congregation, and they both ruled and instructed the people (I Timothy 3:5 and 5:17; Titus 1:9; James 5:14; I Peter 5:1-4; Hebrews 13:7). Inasmuch as this office was the highest and most important in the New Testament, we are not surprised to find a list of qualifications for those who might accept it. It should also be borne in mind that the offices of elder and deacon are much the same and that, therefore, the qualifications are the same for both (I Timothy 3:2; Titus 1:7). When men became ministers of the Word they were ordained by the elders. Timothy was inducted into office by the laying on of hands, and we still use this old method (I Timothy 4:16; Acts 6:6). Thus throughout the New Testament as in the Old we find the elders in authority. The closing book of Revelation, which is an apocalyptic vision, might not be expected to have anything to say of elders. But even there they are prominent. John saw twenty-four around God's great Throne. Some have suggested that they represented the twelve founders of the twelve tribes of Israel in the Old Testament and the twelve Apostles in the New (Revelation 4:4, 10; 5:5, 6, 8, 14; 7:11-13; 11:16; 19:4).

Elected by the People

A highly important rule of the Presbyterian system is that the elders shall be elected by the church members. The elders stand as the representatives of the people. The Presbyterian Church is so positive in its conviction on this point that according to its rules, whenever an elder ceases to represent the congregation in the things he stands for, the congregation has a right to hold a meeting and by a majority vote request the session to dissolve the official relationship between the church and the officer without censure. If the session refuses the request of the congregation then Presbytery can compel the session to act according to the motion passed by the congregation.

The argument for the election of elders by the people is thus briefly presented by Dr. Morris: "When it became necessary to select one as a witness of the resurrection of Christ (see Acts 1:13-26), either there were only two men, Justus and Matthias, who possessed the necessary qualifications; or else they were considered the best qualified among their number and were nominated for election. It matters not whether the lots cast were ballots or an appeal to God by casting lots to choose between the two names. In either case it exhibited the church exercising its right of choice. The sixth chapter of Acts is more explicit in its account of the church in its first election of the deacons; while Acts 14:23, in selecting elders, makes the striking statement in the Greek that they were 'elected by a show of the hands.' These citations are sufficient to prove the right of the people to elect their own representatives contrary to the one man power of appointing—

with its tendency in all ages to develop into 'lords over God's heritage.'" ("Presbyterianism," by S. L. Morris, pages 13-14.)

"Thus from the beginning through all changes in the Church the eldership remained the one pillar of cloud by day, the one pillar of fire by night. Moses passes away, and with Malachi, the dying swan of Old Testament prophecy, that noble, heroic race of prophets passes away, and at last priest and Levite, tabernacle and temple, altar and sacrifice, and the Holy City itself, pass away and the places that have known them know them no more forever; while the eldership modified as to some peculiarities of function, but the same in all essential characteristics, still remained, and yet remains and will remain to the end of time, the one enduring ruling office in the Church of God." ("Presbyterianism," pamphlet by Wm. P. Breed, page 5.)

Equality of Ministers and Elders

In looking over the world, we see other churches which have higher officials than elders. The Roman Catholic Church, the Church of England, and in America the Protestant Episcopal Church all have bishops. These bishops exercise authority over a district or a diocese. The question arises: Is there any biblical authority for this office? We answer confidently that there is not. This form of government in which the bishop holds superior authority is a growth.

The New Testament teaches the absolute equality of all church officers. In it elders and bishops are different words for the same official. The word "bishop" occurs

only six times in the New Testament, and in all these instances the words which precede and follow it make it perfectly clear that the meaning is the same as that of "elder." Paul addressed his Philippian Letter to the "bishops and deacons" (Philippians 1:1). Inasmuch as elders are not mentioned at all and bishops are spoken of in the plural number, it is evident that they were the officers of the local church of Philippi, and thus the same as elders in other churches. In the twentieth chapter of Acts and the seventeenth verse we read that Paul sent from Miletus to Ephesus "and called the elders of the church." In the twenty-eighth verse he spoke of them as "bishops." This is conclusive evidence that the two titles had the same meaning. This interchanging of titles occurs also in the first chapter of his letter to Titus (see verses 5 and 7). Therefore Presbyterians hold emphatically that the two words have the same meaning throughout the New Testament.

The use of two words instead of one may be reasonably explained by the presence of Jewish and Gentile Christians in the Church. The former used the word "elder" from the Old Testament and the synagogue, while the latter used the word "bishop" which was the name of a town official.

Neander, the greatest of church historians, who died in 1850, wrote these words: "It is certain that every church was governed by a union of the elders or overseers chosen from among themselves, and we find among them no individual distinguished above the rest. . . . It is still more important to observe that . . . Clemens Romanus . . . men-

tions only two orders and is silent about the Episcopal office. Moreover, he still uses the word bishop in the older sense in which it occurs in the apostolic writings as a synonym for Presbyter." ("Presbyterianism," pamphlet by Wm. P. Breed, page 6.)

Dr. Lightfoot, a member of the Church of England, canon of St. Paul's Cathedral, a noted scholar and recognized by the world generally as second to none in ability, wrote these words: "It is a fact now generally recognized by theologians of all shades of opinion that in the language of the New Testament the same officer in the Church is called differently bishop and elder or Presbyter" (*Ibid.,* page 8).

Dr. Stanley, dean of Westminster Abbey and a close friend of Queen Victoria, passed this comment on the scholarly investigation of Lightfoot, that he "proved beyond dispute that the early constitution of the Apostolic Church of the first century was not that of a single bishop, but of a body of pastors indifferently styled bishops or Presbyters, and that it was not till the very end of the apostolic age that the office which we now call Episcopacy gradually and slowly made its way into Asia Minor —that Presbytery was not a later growth out of Episcopacy, but that Episcopacy was a later growth out of Presbytery." (*Ibid.,* page 7.)

Many other leading scholars of the Church of England and of our American Protestant Episcopal Church have expressed this same view. Modern scholars have not changed on this subject. Dr. Camden M. Cobern, in his book, "The New Archeological Discoveries," argues for the early date of the "Didache" or "Teaching of the

Twelve Apostles," on the ground that quotations from this very old document show that the bishop was a local officer and even in danger of being regarded as lower than the traveling teacher. In other words, his position is that the "Didache" was written before Episcopacy arose or before 170 A. D. Scholars suppose this old work was written anywhere between the years 100 and 200 A. D. We will quote the passages that refer to bishops: "1. Elect therefore for yourselves bishops and deacons worthy of the Lord, men meek and not lovers of money, and truthful and approved; for they too minister to you the ministry of the prophets and teachers. 2. Therefore despise them not for they are those that are the honored men among you with the prophets and teachers" (New Arch. Disc., page 270).

Professor William Ramsay, in the "Church in the Roman Empire," states that the Episcopal form of church government was complete in its main elements by 170 A. D. (page 363). It arose because the Church had its conflicts with the Roman Empire and "the early system of government by the presiding council of elders was slowly developed to cope with the pressing need, and the Episcopal organization was thus gradually elaborated" (page 366). He writes also: "The word 'Episcopos' means overseer. Originally when the deliberative council of elders resolved to perform some action, they would naturally direct one of their number to superintend it. This Presbyter was an 'Episcopos' for the occasion. . . . It was natural that proved aptness and power in an individual Presbyter should lead to his having executive duties frequently assigned to him. The imperial idea was in the

air, and the tried 'Episcopos' tended to become permanent and to concentrate executive duties in his hands. The process was gradual and no violent change took place," etc. (page 367). "But the 'Episcopos' was very far removed from the monarchial bishop of A. D. 170, and we find not a trace to suggest that he exercised any authority ex officio within the community. He represented it in certain cases; he wrote in its name; but the words purported to be spoken by the community. Letters addressed to it were sent to him, but the contents referred solely to the community and made no allusion to the 'Episcopos.' His position was ostensibly a humble one within the community, and yet its real influence and its future possibilities must have been obvious to him that had eyes to see beneath the superficial aspect" (page 369).

Professor Kurtz in the first volume of his "Church History," page 59, presents an argument on the equality of bishops and elders. He states first the Romanist claim as follows: "According to the Roman Catholic theory, which is also that of the Anglican Episcopal Church, the clerical hierarchial arrangement of the third century which gave to each of the larger churches a bishop as its president with a number of Presbyters and deacons subject to him existed as a divine institution from the beginning." To this claim he replies that it is unequivocally testified by the New Testament and the First Epistle of Clement of Rome (chapters 42, 44, 57) that it had never been disputed down to the close of the first century that bishops and Presbyters are identical. The Romanists and others sought to obviate the force of this objection by the subterfuge that while all bishops were indeed Presbyters,

all Presbyters were not bishops. The ineptitude of such an evasion is apparent. In the Philippian letter (1:1) Paul greeted several bishops and not one. In the twentieth chapter of Acts the Holy Ghost made all the Presbyters of the Ephesus Church to be bishops. Titus 1:5, 7 unconditionally excludes all distinction between elder and bishop. And we learn from I Peter 5:2 that all Presbyters should be "Episkopountes." This author cites the "Didache" mentioned above. He states that in his view bishop and elders were equals in the early Church. He follows the consensus of opinion of the most respected and learned of the church fathers and teachers of later times. He then explains the use of the two words much as we have already done by saying that the word "Episcopos" was used by Gentile Christians to designate the official duty required, and "Presbuteros" was used by Jewish Christians to designate the honorable character of the person holding office.

Unity

In the third place, the Presbyterian Church believes in order and unity. We know that Christ did not intend for His Church to be a mob. And the marvel of government without the form of government cannot be found in history. So let us reiterate that our Church stands for religious order. "It is not a mass meeting administration—a government at random—subject to caprice and prejudice. It is a creature of law and a rule of order. Presbyterianism does not cut loose from authority and give itself the swing of lawless license." It holds a middle ground between Independency and Prelacy. It guards against the

tendency to exaggerate individual rights on the one side and at the same time against a false, exaggerated, slavish and tyrannical clericalism on the other.

Our System of Courts

Our churches are united in a system by higher courts. Any group of Presbyterians can organize a church by electing elders. Any number of churches may form a Presbytery. Any number of Presbyteries may form a Synod and the Synods in turn may form a General Assembly. "The records of each church session will be sent to the Presbytery for examination and approval, or if need be of censure. And the records of Presbytery will be sent to the Synod, and those of the Synod to the General Assembly. Presbyterianism is thus a compact unity and a complete organism. A member of any church suspended or censured by a church session may appeal to the Presbytery, and thence to the Synod, and thence to the General Assembly. It is the native and inalienable right of every member of the Presbyterian Church, however young, however humble, to have his or her cause finally adjudicated by the whole Church in General Assembly convened" (Breed, page 10). Another has given to this thought excellent expression. Here it is: "By its graded system of church courts based upon the unity of the Church, Presbyterianism also throws a shield around the individual most effectually protecting the humblest member of her communion against the injustice of a judgment born of local prejudice or the possible passion of the hour. Just as in our civil affairs, so an adverse judgment in the local church may be appealed from and carried from ses-

sion to Presbytery, and from Presbytery to Synod, and from Synod to General Assembly, until the voice of the entire Church in this highest representative body is heard in the matter, and judgment is rendered under the best conceivable conditions, and justice to the least of God's flock is as perfectly secured as is possible under the imperfections of human nature. Thus no one can be rudely or hastily thrust out of the Church, and snap judgments against God's ministers are made forever impossible" ("Why I Am a Presbyterian," by Herrick Johnson, page 14).

But let it be thoroughly understood by all that Presbyterians do not maintain that their Church is a literal transcript of the Church of the New Testament. They do not hold that the Jerusalem Council before which Paul appeared was a full-blown Synod or General Assembly as these courts are constituted today. But they do emphatically and positively believe that the three main characteristics of their church government are clearly taught in the Word of God. They do believe that Presbyterianism is by divine right. But with these high claims they wash their hands wholly of that exclusivism that asks to be regarded as the only true Church. We wish to be strong and yet tolerant. Thus with humility we claim that our Church is the nearest approach to the New Testament that learning and effort can make.

Questions for Chapter II

1. Where did we get our Church name?
2. What is the first requirement of our Church?
3. Why do we have elders?
4. What are their duties?
5. How are they elected, and why are they elected?
6. Why are ministers and elders on equality?
7. What are the benefits of unity?
8. Describe our system of church courts.
9. Is our Church a literal transcript of the New Testament?
10. Are we tolerant?

Chapter III

The Presbyterian Church and the Reformation

The history of the Presbyterian Church is closely related to the Protestant Reformation of 1517 and cannot be adequately presented without some references to the main points of that great event. It is very easy to point out some of the main features of the Reformation and we will trace our Church history by some of the important items.

Presbyterians hold very positively that their Church is in accord with the New Testament. We believe that the Apostle Paul was a typical Presbyterian and that educated Christians of the first century believed the doctrines in our Creed, commonly known today as Calvinistic. But let it be thoroughly understood that Calvin did not invent this system of doctrines. The Bible writers put them down in the Old and New Testaments. But for centuries they had gone more or less without emphasis until Calvin restored them. Soon after the apostles the Church became ritualistic and formal and lost its most precious truths.

The interesting question arises: Did the principles held by the Presbyterian Church disappear after the death of the apostles? Or were these principles held by surviving bodies of Christians here and there over the world? We think the facts warrant the statement that some bodies holding these principles seem to have lived through the centuries. The principles of these bodies were very much like those of the New Testament Church. These persisting bodies we think were more closely related to the

Presbyterian Church of modern times than to any other denomination.

It seems that Christianity was taken to Britain about A. D. 35. Baronius, the Roman Catholic historian, asserts this on the authority of manuscripts in the Vatican. Tertullian, who was converted to Christianity 190 A. D., says that the parts of Britain that were inaccessible to the Romans and thus escaped the persecutions of the Emperor, were Christian. He perhaps meant Scotland and Ireland and inland parts of Britain. Professor Dosker has written: "British Christianity evidently antedates Catholic church life on the Islands. Its peculiarities prove it. According to Gildes, the Wise, Cunobileius, a hostage, sent to Rome by Suetonius in 59 A. D., stayed there seven years, and may have been taught by Paul. Or Paul himself may have visited the Islands. In any case the British Church has a marked Pauline cast." ("Outline of Church History," page 69, and "Kurtz Church History," Vol. I, page 453.) If this church was Pauline, it was very likely closely related to the Presbyterian Church of today. Newman, the Baptist historian, writes: "The best example of the persistence of a somewhat primitive type of Christianity is probably that of the ancient British Church." ("History of Anti-pedobaptism," page 22.) During the fourth and fifth centuries the British Church seems to have avoided somewhat the paganism that permeated the churches of Continental Europe. Diocesan Episcopacy seems not to have existed among them. They studied the Scriptures, trained their pastors and sent out missionaries to Ireland, Scotland, France and Germany. They were humble and simple in their forms of worship. Patrick,

who left an autobiography, tells us that his father was a deacon and his grandfather a presbyter. Patrick evangelized Ireland. Columba planted churches in Scotland. A third missionary, Columbanus, in the year 585, took seventeen companions and founded three thriving missionary centers in Burgundy. He also went up the Rhine Valley, and into Switzerland, and then to Northern Italy. In the middle of the eighth century his Irish-Scottish Church was predominant throughout the Rhine Valley, Thuringia and Bavaria. ("History of Anti-pedobaptism," page 23.) In the south and west of Germany a simple scriptural Church preached justification by faith, without a mass, confession, or Pope. Such a Church also existed "from the Pyrenees to the Scheldt, from Chur to Utrecht." This Church evidently did not hold the principle of adult baptism, and was nearer the Presbyterian than the Baptist.

The ancient British Church was terribly persecuted by the Saxon Kings, who were urged on by the Roman Catholic Church. But the Churches maintained their existence in Scotland and Wales until the eleventh century. Newman has written: "It is probable that they were never completely destroyed and that they reappeared in the Lollards of the fourteenth century." (*Ibid.,* page 23.) The Lollards were founded by John Wycliffe, the Morning Star of the Reformation. And those who study Wycliffe's principles are impressed with their similarity to Presbyterianism. Here are his principles:

1. All power is from God. The royal is as sacred as the ecclesiastical. The King is as truly God's vicar as the Pope.

2. Each individual is responsible to God immediately and not through a mediating priesthood. To God and Him alone men should appeal.

3. The bread in the communion is not the real body of Christ but a sign.

4. The Roman Catholic Church has no claim to any superiority or headship over other Churches.

5. Temporal privileges cannot be demanded by spiritual censures.

6. Church courts should be subject to civil courts.

7. The ministry ought not to possess wealth but should be supported by voluntary contributions of church members.

8. Image worship and pilgrimages to holy places are idolatry.

9. Priests have no power to absolve from sin.

10. The Bible is the only ground of faith, and every man should have the right to examine it for himself.

11. Bishops and presbyters are equal in rank.

We would say again that Wycliffe was very close to the modern Presbyterian Church and nearer to our Church than any other. We have said that he founded the Lollards, and of them Newman, the Baptist historian, has written: "Lollardism was the forerunner of all that was best in English Puritanism, from which, in an important sense, modern Baptists have derived their origin. But we have searched in vain for any satisfactory proof that it embodied distinctively Baptist principles or practices." ("History of Anti-pedobaptism," page 55.) It should also

be added that Wycliffe was an Augustinian in his doctrine of grace. ("Dosker's Outline," page 132.) Now it is important for our view that Lollardism continued in England and Scotland until the Reformation in 1517. ("Newman's History," page 341.) Other groups attract our notice. From Wycliffe's teachings the Hussites arose. They were less radical than he and tolerated practices that he rejected. ("Dosker's Outline," page 133.) There is another sect of the period that has attracted much attention, the Waldenses. They came from Peter Waldo's conversion and preaching. He gave up home and property about 1173 and undertook the Lord's work. At the time he was a prosperous young merchant prince of Lyons. But he did not intend to form a sect. He only claimed for himself and his followers the right to evangelize as laymen. ("Newman's History," page 40.) The sect he originated was evidently strongly Augustinian in theology, but also more like the modern Methodists than any other denomination. (*Ibid.,* pages 41 and 44.)

By such reasoning as indicated it appears that the evangelical bodies that persisted were more like Presbyterians than any other modern churchmen.

But let us return to the first century again and come forward with other important truths. From a simple Church of the apostles the Church drifted into Episcopacy and was Episcopal in its main elements by the year 170 A. D. As years passed the Church gradually lost the great truth that salvation is a gift to those who believe in Christ, and taught in its stead something that pleased human nature better, namely, that men are saved by works. The Church claimed to be above the Bible and

asserted its right to bind things on earth for Heaven. This is commonly known as the Roman Catholic Doctrine of the Keys. Men began confessing to priests who claimed power to absolve them from their sins. As the priestly idea gained ground a magical virtue was attributed to the sacraments, and preaching was for this reason looked upon as unimportant and fell into neglect. Henceforth it became the priest's principal business to hear confessions, prescribe penance and celebrate mass ("Reed's History of Pres. Church," page 5). Centuries passed and the Church became corrupt. This led good men to think of reform. And naturally the first reformers were men within the Church. They were Roman Catholic priests whose consciences rebelled at what the Church taught and practiced, and they sought to do away with the things that were unbiblical and un-Christian.

But let us return a third time to the first century and come forward with a different reasoning. Jesus selected the disciples, trained them in His truth, warned them against false teachers, endowed them with His Spirit and sent them out to build His Church in the world. The twelve and the seventy preached and taught, and some of them wrote. One of the great converts was Paul and he claimed that he received the truth by special revelation; that he saw Christ in a vision and got his truth direct from the Saviour. He met errors and wrote to correct them. His companions, Silas, Timothy and Titus, were all well-trained men.

After the apostles and their immediate followers there lived a number of able men commonly called Church Fathers. They were teachers, preachers, writers. We can-

not take space to write of them but a brief account of each one will be found in the first volume of Dr. Briggs' "History of the Study of Theology." The author adopted Carlyle's suggestion that the history of mankind is the history of its great men. Writers have more and more adopted this method of writing history. Men are now more interested in biography than in any previous day. Thus the presentation of history around great men is popular, and the method has the advantage of simplicity.

In 353 Augustine was born. He was destined to be the greatest scholar of the west after Jerome, and a great polemic and theological writer of immense range and scholarship. He delved deep into philosophy, mastered logic, mathematics and music; taught rhetoric in Tagaste, Carthage, Rome and Milan; and at the age of thirty-three years was converted to Christianity. At Hippo in North Africa he presided over what was virtually a training school for ministers. Pious bishops of the then numerous strong Churches in North Africa vied with each other in imitating him. He studied the Bible carefully and wrote exposures of the errors of the Manichaeans, Donatists, Pelagians and Semi-Pelagians. He stated clearly and with proof-texts from the Bible what this great Book taught on the great subjects of theology. His works became the authority for the West and remain so to this day.

From Augustine we may jump many centuries to John Wycliffe, whom we have already mentioned. He was born in 1325 and died in 1384. Here was a man who lived five centuries ago and yet his mind was on a level with ours. He deserves all that men have written of his

scholarship and vision. He was born in England and became an Augustinian in theology and revived the study of the Bible that for centuries had been neglected. He translated the Bible from Latin into English and taught that the Bible was a higher authority than the Church. One of his statements became the watchword of the Puritans in later times: "The Holy Spirit teaches us the sense of the Scripture as Christ opened the Scriptures to His apostles." (Briggs' "Hist. of Theol.," Vol. II, page 272.) One of his disciples wrote of him: "From him one could learn in truth what the Church of Christ is, and how it should be ruled and led." (*Ibid.,* page 72.) He established an order of poor preaching priests called the Lollards.

It was fortunate that Wycliffe lived in England. In this famous island religious reform found a congenial clime. The English always fretted under Papal authority, and here the Papal thunder could not silence Wycliffe. "He laid in England and Scotland a foundation so broad and deep that neither kings, nor bishops, nor the rack, nor the fire, could every destroy it."

This tribute has been written of him: "Look down the centuries and see this man of more than five hundred years ago, with his feet planted away down in the fourteenth century, yet rising so high above his day and generation that we can, without bending our heads, look into his eyes and behold them gleaming with a Protestantism that vies with our own. What a magnificent giant. His work is on our Bibles, for he gave to Scripture translation the sacred style it has never lost in the English."

John Huss

Wycliffe's principles were adopted by John Huss and he carried them to Bohemia. Huss was born in 1369 and burned at the stake as a heretic in 1415 when he was forty-six years old. His colleague, Jerome of Prague, suffered the same fate soon after. Huss died at the hands of the Council of Constance, which had summoned him to appear before it, the council disgracing itself by violating his safe conduct. His dying words were: "In the truth of the Gospel which I have written, taught and preached, will I die today with gladness." ("Briggs' Hist. of Theol.," page 73.) But before his death a majority of the Bohemians had become his followers and were committed to Reformation principles, and the influence of the great John Huss went on long after his spirit had taken its flight to God.

Printing

Another vital factor in bringing the Reformation was the invention of printing in 1450. Without it the pamphlets and books that spread the Reformation views could not have been sent out.

Universities

Another thing of great importance in promoting the coming of the Reformation was the founding of a great number of universities. That of Paris had grown out of a cathedral school, and students from it migrated to found many others. Forty-one of the great universities of Europe were founded between 1348 and 1500. We can read-

ily understand that they wielded a mighty cumulative influence toward the year 1517 when Luther blew the trumpet blast of reform that awoke the world.

Revival of Learning and Erasmus

Another very influential man was Erasmus. He spent ten years studying in a monastery and later went to Paris and studied and taught in the university. He became the greatest scholar of his age and traveled from university to university in France, England, Italy, Switzerland and Holland in the interest of scholarship and learning. He also worked for the reform of the Church and translated the Greek New Testament in 1516. These words were spoken by him: "I wanted to construct a road for other persons of high aims, so that they might be less impeded by pools and stumbling blocks in carrying home those fair and glorious treasures."

But Erasmus opposed Luther. This has often been misunderstood. He was one of those fine souls who dreaded a conflict. He followed the Christ of gentleness, and wanted all to be members of one body, quickened by one spirit, attached to one head, united by the same sacraments, and living in hope of one Heaven. He could not think of a greater disaster than that of the reformers going out of the Roman Catholic Church. Thus in his desire for a peaceable reform by education, and not by revolution he was followed by both Continental and English Humanists. It was their idea that through study of the Greek and Hebrew Scriptures and the writings of the early Church Fathers the wrongs could all be corrected. Most of the Humanists remained Catholics.

Luther

But Luther and Zwingli came and their reformation of religion pushed the reformation of scholarship into the background.

Martin Luther was born in 1483, studied law at the University of Erfurt, and was converted during a terrible forest storm when his companion was killed by a bolt of lightning. He entered the Augustinian order and later became a priest, and later a professor in the University of Wittenburg. In 1513 he turned to Bible lecturing. He followed Augustine's teaching and found the prophets and apostles preferable to the Fathers and Schoolmen. He called men back to the Son of God. Zwingli said of Luther: "He has searched out the meaning of Scripture with greater earnestness than any one on earth has done for a thousand years." The chief virtue of Luther was his fidelity to the truth. At the Diet of Worms in 1521 he cried: "My conscience is bound in the Word of God; I cannot and will not recant anything. . . . Here I stand, I cannot do otherwise. God help me."

Luther first appeared as a Reformer in 1517 when he was thirty-four years old, when he nailed ninety-five theses against the sale of indulgences on the church door in Wittenburg. He claimed in these that he was upholding the Scriptures and the teaching of the Church. He was correct, but in the heat of controversy he came into conflict with the common teaching and practice of the Church as expressed in the writings of great theologians and in Papal decrees.

Luther translated the Bible into German. This Bible was widely circulated in cheap editions and helped the Reformation cause. Luther also wrote sermons, catechisms and hymns. He was an interpreter, logician, orator, and whatever he wrote or said pierced the soul and fixed itself in the heart like an arrow. He found the Church in bondage to a vast system of legalism. In opposition he presented the teachings of Christ and Paul as the great transforming power for his and every age. He spoke the master word that set men free.

Melancthon

One of Luther's contemporaries was Philip Melancthon (1497 to 1560). He was well educated and taught the Classics at Tubingen and Greek at Wittenburg. He reformed the method of this latter university and thus gave the model for the Protestant universities of Germany. He became a theologian, basing his teachings largely on the Epistle to the Romans. He wrote the Augsburg Confession of Faith and prepared other statements of doctrine, and his statements became the theology of the Lutheran Reformation.

Zwingli

Another contemporary of Luther was Huldreich Zwingli (1485 to 1531). He was educated in Greek and Hebrew and drew his doctrines from the Bible in the original languages. "In 1532 he published sixty-seven theses exalting Christ as the only Saviour, and the Holy Scriptures as the only infallible authority. These articles are more comprehensive and dogmatic than those of Luther.

They became the basis of the Reformation in Switzerland." It should be stated Zwingli began his reform independently of Luther and from a different point of view. He was stirred against idolatry rather than against the abuse of indulgences. But like Luther he appealed to the Scriptures.

Calvin

The greatest man connected with the Reformation was one whom all Presbyterians honor, John Calvin, born in 1509, at Noyon, in France. He died in 1564. He studied for the priesthood and then turned his attention to law. He became a Protestant, and in 1534 he was compelled to flee from the University of Paris for expressing his views. He retired to Basel, studied Hebrew, and published his theology in 1536, the most important work of the entire century.

Calvin went to Geneva in Switzerland and joined Farel in reforming the Church there. He was driven away in 1538, but recalled in 1541. Then he became the chief reformer of Protestantism throughout the world. He organized the Church on a presbyterial basis and in 1559 founded the Geneva Academy. The influence of this school can never be measured. Here were educated the men who went into all countries and preached Reformation principles. Courses were taught in Hebrew, Greek, Bible, Theology, Physics, Mathematics, Rhetoric. When Calvin died in 1564 there were 1,500 students in the university. The first year it opened there were 800.

Religion and education have always gone hand in hand. Religion without education degenerates into superstition

and fanaticism. It is natural for the educated mind taught by the Spirit to master more adequately the knowledge of God as revealed by Jesus Christ.

Calvin also helped to unify the various Reformed Churches of Europe by writing many letters. He kept in touch with English, Waldensian and Bohemian leaders, and was a friend of Luther and Melancthon.

In his theology, which was Augustinian, he was more moderate than Luther, and to Beza, his successor, must be credited the higher scholastic theology that produced strong controversies. At Calvin's death in 1564 Beza became the leader of the reformed world, and the Protestant youth from all lands for the next forty years came to hear from his lips the purest Augustinian orthodoxy.

The Most Influential Man of Modern Times

So Calvin, the scholar and university organizer, became perhaps the most influential man for righteousness in modern times. We think a study of history warrants this eulogistic statement that he was the greatest man produced in the last five hundred years.

Some have not liked Calvin's theology because of its principle of predestination. But Warfield has written: "There was accordingly no difference among the Reformers on this point: Luther and Melancthon and the compromising Bucer were no less zealous for absolute predestination than Zwingli and Calvin." ("Calvin as a Theologian and Calvinism Today," pamphlet by Warfield, page 20.) Those who have disapproved of his theology have sought sometimes to belittle it by calling attention to the fact that the heretic Servetus was burned by Calvin's order.

But regrettable as was this incident, and as much as we, as well as all, wish that it had not happened to cast a slur on one so great, let us know the facts about it.

The Error of An Age

Calvin's crime is mitigated by the fact that he held in common with all the reformers that heretics should be put to death. This had been the principle of the Roman Catholic Church for centuries.

Heresy was considered the greatest of all crimes, even greater than murder, because it destroyed souls for time and eternity. The Roman Catholic Church had already tried Servetus and condemned him to death and he had escaped. He came to Geneva and expressed his views loudly. His attitude was brazen. Thus he was duly tried by the city courts and found guilty. Calvin tried to persuade him to correct his errors, but he refused. Calvin then sought a mitigation of the death sentence and was not successful and Servetus was executed. Geneva was the best town morally in that day. But in Geneva in four years there were fifty-seven death sentences and seventy-six sentences of banishment. In such a day the proud and brazen manner of Servetus would have sent him to death almost anywhere in the world. (See also "Presbyterians," by Lingle, pages 43-44, and "The Presbyterian Churches," by Moffatt, page 36.)

Questions for Chapter III

1. Give the date of the Reformation.
2. Was Calvin the founder or restorer of our system of government, and doctrine?
3. Did this government and doctrine ever cease entirely?
4. What is the best example of the persistence of New Testament Christianity?
5. Was the early British church missionary?
6. What title has been given to Wycliffe?
7. What did he stand for?
8. By what date was the Romish system completed?
9. Tell what it stood for.
10. Who was Augustine?
11. Name three things that helped to bring the Reformation.
12. Name four great Reformers.
13. Describe Calvin's work.

Chapter IV

John Calvin, Founder of Liberty

If John Calvin was the greatest man in five hundred years we must tell why. Before speaking of Calvin and his Presbyterian followers, we wish to present a few thoughts that relate to the claim of a small minority of our Baptist brethren who have voiced loudly the view that their denomination fought the battle for freedom. The Baptist denomination is Calvinistic, but it is only fair to state that at the time the battle for freedom was fought in Europe, their progenitors, known in history as the Anabaptists, were intensely fanatical and too weak and widely scattered to exercise any great influence. The late Dr. Dosker wrote: "Without question, these Anabaptists stood for radical changes in every respect. But in the day of the Reformation they nowhere succeeded in making a deep and lasting impression on their environment. They grooved no channels along which historical currents could run; they did not grip nations as such; their very radicalism proved their inherent weakness, whilst the austerity of their religious ideals repelled outsiders and caused innumerable schisms and divisions among them."

The Anabaptists may be divided into the radicals and conservatives. Both groups rejected infant baptism, but both practiced sprinkling. The influence of the conservatives was more than offset by the fanaticism of the radicals, and unless one is acquainted with the history of the Anabaptists one will not possess even an inkling of their strange and ridiculous doings. We will give some illustrations of their excesses taken from "Kurtz's Church His-

tory," Volume II, pages 390-405. Corroborations of these strange doings will be found in "The Dutch Anabaptists," by Dosker, and the "History of Anti-pedobaptism," by Newman.

The Anabaptists began, according to Protestant historians generally, in 1521. They were at one with Luther and Zwingli in seeking the elimination of the doctrines and practices of the Roman Catholic Church, but they thought the Reformers were not going far enough and denounced them as still rooted in the Papacy. In this emphasis they did much good.

The chief principle of the Anabaptists was the separation of the Kingdom of God and the kingdoms of the world. They hoped to gather the converted into an earthly kingdom of saints and bring the millennium. They regarded the State with its courts and punishments as belonging to the domain of evil and to be endured only as long as there were unconverted people. They thought that the community did not need these things, and that their people ought not to hold governmental positions. Their law code was in the Bible alone. In their principles they emphasized the ethical and practical and they rejected the grand Reformation dogma of justification by faith.

The Anabaptists flourished in Switzerland from about 1524 to 1527. In Zurich and the vicinity there were many congregations. In 1525 many were expelled from the country and spread over South Germany, where they grew rapidly among the industrial classes. But they were terribly persecuted by Protestants and Catholics alike, most severely by the latter. According to their memoirs, 2,419 were put to death before 1581 in Switzerland, Aus-

tria and South Germany. Men were burned and women were drowned.

Council of Vienna

The eccentric views of the Anabaptists are shown by the items of their Council which met at Vienna in 1550. They held, among other things, that Christ is not supernatural, but a man with divine power; that there are neither angels nor devils in the proper sense, and where the Bible speaks of the devil it means the fleshly mind of man. The grave is the only hell, and here the elect sleep till the last day. The souls of the ungodly as well as their bodies perish at death. In birth, men are given the power of begetting the spirit. The death of Christ has no merit other than that it bears witness of righteousness, mercy and love. ("Church History," by Kurtz, Volume 2, page 400.)

Such principles as these would establish our point that the Anabaptists were fanatics, but there are many other things that point in this direction. Melchior Hoffman was the most noted of the older Anabaptists in northwestern Germany. He proclaimed that the second coming of Christ would occur in seven years, and finally announced that he, himself, was the Elijah foretold in Malachi 4:4-5. He held that Jesus did not receive of Mary's flesh and blood, but passed through her as light through a glass. But let us say in his favor that otherwise he was not fanatical and that he was morally pure, benevolent and kind.

In 1530 a strange Anabaptist movement broke out in Holland. Jan Mathys proclaimed that the millennium

had come, preached that the State should be violently destroyed, that the ungodly should be put to death, and that the saints as promised in the Bible should rule the world.

In Munster, in 1534, there was a wild undertaking by John Bockelssohn Leyden. He preached fluently and Anabaptists flocked in from everywhere. A man named Matthys assumed that he was a prophet, and said that all unbelievers should be driven from the city. This was done in February, 1534, and the property of all unbelievers was divided among the Anabaptists. The city was besieged. Matthys was killed in a sortie. John Leyden became the leader and prophet and set up a government of twelve elders, introduced polygamy, and married seventeen women. One of his colleagues married four wives. Two hundred better spirits who protested against such infamy were massacred to the last man. John Leyden proclaimed himself king of the whole earth and set up a gorgeous court that indulged in atrocious sins. He sent out twenty-eight apostles to spread his kingdom and appointed twelve dukes to rule the world under him. The city was finally taken, and John Leyden, his premier and chancellor, all three, were pinched to death with red-hot pincers, and their bodies were hung in iron chains from St. Lambert's tower. The wild actions of the radicals of Munster gave the Anabaptists a black reputation everywhere. Newman has written: "No episode in history has done so much to impede the progress of Baptist principles as that of Munster. Its influence is still quite marked in Germany and other European countries." ("Hist. Antip.," by Newman, page 292.) Dosker has written: "The Munster experience wrought irreparable harm to the Reformation, and thousands who blindly identified all branches of

Protestantism with those riotous Anabaptists, drew back with a sigh of relief in the embrace of the old Church, which, after all, seemed like a harbor of refuge in the dreadful cataclysm of human passions." ("Dut. Anabap.," page 65.)

David Joris, another Anabaptist leader, denied all the cardinal truths of Christianity. He held that he was the true Christ and Messiah; that Jesus did not arise in the Resurrection, but was now reincarnated in him; that he could pardon sin or damn forever, and that at the last day he would judge the world, and that he would again raise the House of Israel and the tribe of Levi with the true tabernacle. Such principles were ridiculous, you say, but he gained a great following. His fiery oratory and hysterical utterance swept many away. ("Dut. Anabap.," page 54.)

John Denck was another Anabaptist leader. He was one of the most intelligent men of the day. He died in 1527. But he placed the inner word of God above the outward and reduced the person of Christ to a mere pattern. He became the head of the German Anabaptist movement, and Bucer called him the Pope of the Baptists. ("Ch. Hist.," by Kurtz, Vol. II, page 407.)

These incidents indicate the fanatical spirit of the radical Anabaptists that detracted from their influence and made them ineffective in the Reformation. We are glad to state that other leaders were noble and conservative and did much to make men think along right lines. We are also glad to state that the majority of the Anabaptists were not responsible for the excesses of the few. But the excesses were numerous and large numbers were fanatics. Thus all were hated. Their opponents never made a dis-

tinction between the desirable and the undesirable. Many were quiet, industrious, thrifty, obedient and pious, and yet they were hated. The Moravian Anabaptists were a quiet and excellent people (see "Ch. Hist.," by Kurtz, Vol. II, page 399), but all were compelled to face the odium created by the eccentric leaders and their followers. We are not surprised, then, to find many great men condemning the Anabaptists in scathing language. Guido de Bres, author of the Belgic Confession and the most celebrated martyr of the Spanish Inquisition, who was hung at Valenciennes in 1567, called the Anabaptists, "the tares in the wheat." ("Dut. Anab.," page 43.) Luther, Melancthon, Calvin, Zwingli—in fact, all the Reformation leaders—seemed to vie with each other in passing harsh condemnations on this hated sect. (*Ibid.*, page 45.)

Only in England, to which they came in great numbers from 1528 to 1573, do we find their record favorable. It has been estimated that the number in England by 1573 was about fifty thousand. But the laws of the land were bitter against them and their safety depended upon their lying hidden. Whenever they asserted themselves or thrust their peculiar views upon those around them they were in danger. This is without doubt the reason that the Anabaptists made a favorable record in England. If they had been free to assert themselves they would have undoubtedly gone to fanatical excesses as they did on the continent of Europe. Many of the earlier Anabaptist refugees to England were followers of Hoffman, who was fanatical, as we have already told. He was uneducated, fiery of tongue, strong in imagination, and visionary. When in Holland, Lutheranism had been killed by persecution, and before Calvinism made its appearance, Mel-

chior Hoffman had passed through the Lowlands with the swiftness of a meteor and roused the masses. He pictured a glorious future with himself as the modern Elijah, with the millennium to begin in 1533, and with Strassburg as the New Jerusalem, claimed that his own prophecies were equal to those of Jeremiah or Elijah, and denied the divinity of Jesus Christ. ("Dut. Anab.," pages 50 and 67.) But the later English Anabaptists were of the Mennonite type and conservative and worthy, but the excesses of their brethren destroyed the influence for good they might have had. We are not at all surprised to find that the Anabaptists did not touch English church life. Newman has written correctly that "Every record of these people during the sixteenth century indicates that they were foreigners, chiefly Dutch, who made little if any impression on the people of England, who were the last of any people to adopt Antipedobaptist sentiments." ("Hist. of Antiped.," page 345.) The great bulk of the Anabaptists were absorbed by the English population and furnished strength for those who should come later and bring the Reformation. But as an individual force they amounted to little or nothing.

The Baptists have claimed that the principle of religious liberty was first announced by Baptists in Switzerland. This claim is made because an Anabaptist named Hubmaier made a splendid plea for soul liberty at Steffhausen about the year 1525. His subject was "Heretics and Their Burners." ("Hist. Antiped.," page 96.) Previous to 1531, when the Munster outrage occurred, the Anabaptists were a small scattered band. But the Munster fanaticism spread like wildfire, and the Anabaptists multiplied rapidly and furnished a numerical foundation for the organization

and reforms of that fine Anabaptist soul, Menno Simons, in 1535. But long before all these dates, men had died for religious freedom. Between 1478 and 1498 it has been estimated that the Inquisition punished 30,000 persons and burned alive 8,000. When we note the great numbers of martyrs and study the history of such groups as the Lollards, Waldenses and Brethren of the Common Life, it is hard to believe that some did not have adequate views on the separation of Church and State. Again, these early Anabaptists were not altogether like Baptists of today. It is true that they practiced adult baptism, but all without exception sprinkled in administering this sacrament. With them the emphasis was placed on the age that baptism should be given, and they did not once question the mode of baptism.

As for the claim that Baptists first advocated soul liberty in England, this is based on John Smyth's Confession in 1611. But previous to this, in 1516, Sir Thomas More had written religious liberty into his "Utopia." The Baptist contention that his work was merely a dream of an ideal republic, and that Sir Thomas More himself did not practice religious liberty does not affect the fact that such ideas were known one hundred years before "Smyth's Confession," and even before Hubmaier wrote his manuscript on "Heretics and Their Burners." Again, the "Union of Utrecht" was written in 1579. This was the bond of union of the Protestant counties of Holland and the instrument of that republic. It stated the principle of religious liberty. It is to the praise of John Calvin that this instrument was written by one of his students. ("Ch. Hist.," by Kurtz, Vol. 2, page 234.)

It is true that Baptists and Presbyterians owe much to each other. Undoubtedly the fanatical Anabaptists helped to carry Protestantism away from Rome. And the conservative Anabaptists dignified their cause. But the unwillingness of the conservatives to fight or enter military service made them of little worth in the days when men fought for their rights. The worthy Mennonites of Holland refused to fight when it seemed that all should have taken arms against Spain. Newman has written: "In the forty years' struggle with Spain that began in 1568, the Mennonites occupied the somewhat inconsistent position of being liberal contributors to the expense of the war, and assisting the patriotic cause in every possible indirect way, and yet refusing on conscientious grounds to bear arms." ("Hist. Antiped.," page 315.)

We say, then, that it was Calvinism that nerved the armies, and that without it Protestanism would have been weak and useless. It could not have conquered England, America, France, Switzerland, Germany, Holland, Scotland.

We can give here but one illustration of how Presbyterians fought for liberty. In Holland the Anabaptists were known as Mennonites. In writing of the persecutions of the Dutch by the Spanish, Dr. Newman states: "The effect of the persecution was to intensify the enthusiasm of the Calvinists. Their preachers did not hesitate to risk their lives in proclaiming the truth, and thousands would gather to hear them. A large number of Mennonites suffered among the rest, but as they were on principle quiet and non-resisting and did not openly antagonize their persecutors, they probably suffered less in proportion to their numbers than the Calvinists. The conviction was

growing upon the people of the Netherlands that the time was at hand when by a desperate struggle the galling Spanish-Catholic yoke must be thrown off. The Mennonites, with their radical opposition to warfare and their principle of absolute non-resistance, could not, under the circumstances, hope to win to their cause the controlling life of the land. Men like William of Orange sympathized deeply with the Mennonites in many things; but if he and others who were like-minded had united themselves with their non-resisting friends, they would all together, so far as we can see, have been led like sheep to the slaughter by the relentless Spaniards. It was in the very nature of things that militant Calvinism should carry the day." ("Hist. Antiped.," page 314.)

There have been enthusiasts who thought that the Anabaptist principles could be traced back to the apostles. But now it is admitted by all better minds that this cannot be done. The Lollards did not hold distinctively Baptist principles or practices. In fact they were much nearer the Presbyterians. The early Waldenses had scarcely anything in common with Baptists, and the same may be said of the Bohemian Brethren and the Taborites. Many Baptist writers have sought to find their line through earlier sects such as the Montanists, Novatians, Donatists, and others, but these efforts have proved fruitless. ("Hist. Antiped.," page 15; also pages 28 and 30.) Dr. Benedict was one who claimed that he could trace back the Baptists through all the past centuries. Dr. Keller was another writer with the same view. But the reasoning of such writers is without foundation. Professor Kurtz, the noted historian, has written in regard to this: "The baselessness of Keller's arguments has been thoroughly exposed by

Kolde and Carl Muller, yet he continues unweariedly to repeat and set them forth." ("Ch. Hist.," Vol. 2, page 395.) Baptists of scholarship now point to the year 1641 as the origin of their denomination. ("Dutch Anabap.," page 17.)

Lutherans

It is significant that neither can the Lutherans claim to be the founders of modern liberty. Luther retained in his system many elements of Roman Catholicism. He made penance a sacrament. He clung to priestly views of the ministry. He was a realist in the doctrine of the Lord's Supper and he held that rulers might determine the faith of their subjects. The Reformation of Luther lacked a great deal of being what the average person thinks it was.

But Calvin broke away from all these things. The superiority of Calvin's work has been splendidly expressed in these words: "Where his views came into contact with Lutheranism, and the two systems were permitted to contest the ground on equal terms, as in the Palatinate, Holland and Hungary, Calvinism with its associated Presbyterianism won the day. Professor Heron, of Belfast, has hardly overstated the case when he says that 'wherever the Reformation had free course, wherever it was permitted to shape itself spontaneously after Scripture, and without external influence it assumed a Presbyterian form.'" ("Reed's Hist. of Pres. Ch.," page 386.) Dr. Dosker has written an apt conclusion in the words: "The Germans drank in the spirit of the aristocratic, ecclesiastical idea of Luther in the same way as the French, Dutch, English and Scotch came under the influence of the Calvinistic ideal, and were thereby committed to democracy."

("Dutch Anabap.") We cannot help but conclude that if Germany had been won to Calvinism, instead of the German Empire engaging in the World War, it would have long previously been won to democracy.

Questions for Chapter IV

1. What weakened the influence of the Anabaptists?
2. What two classes existed in this sect?
3. What did they reject?
4. What mode of baptism did they use?
5. When did this sect begin?
6. Describe the fanaticism of the Anabaptists.
7. Describe the Munster Rebellion.
8. What did the Reformers think of them?
9. Who first advocated soul liberty in England?
10. In what way did the Anabaptists aid in the battle for liberty?
11. Can Anabaptist principles be traced to the Apostles?

Chapter V

Calvin, the Founder of Republics

John Calvin placed emphasis upon the glory of God and the equality of all men. As God was made great, the kings became small and the rights of the individual were more and more recognized.

Quotations almost without number could be given from recognized scholars and historians to emphasize the tremendous importance of John Calvin's work. We will present a few.

Professor Fisk has written: "The promulgation of Calvin's theology was one of the longest steps that mankind has taken toward personal freedom." The same authority also said of Calvinism: "It was a religion fit to inspire men who were to be called upon to fight for freedom."

John Richard Green, the noted English historian, wrote: "It is in Calvinism that the modern world strikes its roots; for it was Calvinism that first revealed the worth and dignity of man. Called of God and an heir of Heaven, the trader at his counter and the digger in his field suddenly rose into equality with the noble and the king." The same authority called Calvin's church organization "a Christian republic," and "a Christian state in which the true sovereign was not Pope or Bishop but the Christian man." He also wrote these words: "As a vast and consecrated democracy it stood in contrast with the whole social and political framework of the European nations." These words indicate what a tremendous thing this doctrine was and the immense influence for good that was exerted by the man who founded it.

Bancroft, the historian, was an Anglican, but he said much in praise of Calvin and Calvinism. He wrote: "The right exercised by each congregation of electing its own ministers was in itself a moral revolution. Religion was now with the people, not over the people." Again he wrote: "Calvinism was revolutionary; it taught as a divine revelation the natural equality of man." And again: "It is in season to rebuke the intolerance which would limit the praise of Calvin to a single sect. . . . He possessed the richest mind of his age. . . . Calvin was not only the founder of a sect but the foremost among the most efficient of modern republican legislators. More truly benevolent to the human race than Solon, more self-denying than Lycurgus, the genius of Calvin infused enduring elements into the institutions of Geneva and made it for the modern world the impregnable fortress of popular liberty, the fertile seed-lot of democracy." ("Calvin Defended," page 199.) Again we find the same writer giving voice to these words: "Calvinism opposed hereditary monarchy, aristocracy, and bondage."

Froude wrote many tributes to Calvin and Calvinism. Of the latter he wrote: "It has been able to inspire the bravest efforts ever made by man to break the yoke of unjust authority. When all else has failed; when patriotism has covered its face, and human courage has broken down; when intellect has yielded with a smile or a sigh; when emotion and sentiment have become the handmaids of superstition, and have dreamt themselves into forgetfulness that there was any difference between truth and lies, the slavish form of belief called Calvinism has borne an inflexible front to illusion and mendacity, and has preferred rather to be ground to powder like flint than to

bend before violence or melt under enervating temptation."

Again he wrote: "Whatever was the cause, the Calvinists were the only fighting Protestants. It was they whose faith gave them courage to stand up for the Reformation, and but for them the Reformation would have been crushed." (Quoted by Ogilvie, in "Presbyterian Churches," page 160.)

Mark Pattison wrote: "The policy of Calvin was a vigorous effort to supply what the revolutionary movement wanted—a positive education of the individual soul. The power thus generated was too expansive to be confined to Geneva. It went forth into all countries. . . . This, and this alone, enabled the Reformation to make head against the terrible repressive forces brought to bear by Spain, the Inquisition and the Jesuits. Sparta against Persia was not such odds as Geneva against Spain. Calvinism saved Europe." (*Ibid.*, page 160.)

And again: "No grander figure can be found in the history of the Reformation than John Knox, who was a pupil of Calvin in Geneva, for the spirit which he created saved Scotland, and Scotland was all that saved England." (Page 437.)

Motley, an agnostic, in his "Dutch Republic," has much to say of Calvin and Calvinism. Listen to this: "In England, the seeds of liberty wrapped up in Calvinism were destined to bear the largest harvest of freedom in nations yet unborn." (Vol. 3, page 120.) Of France he wrote: "Throughout the blood-stained soil of France the men who fought against Philip II and the Inquisition knelt before going to battle and uttered a Calvinistic prayer, and then charged under the white plume of the Bernese." Of

Holland he wrote: "The fires had been lighted by the hands of Calvinists which had consumed the last vestige of royal and sacredotal despotism throughout the Dutch republic."

Dr. Schaff, the noted church historian, wrote of Calvin: "There was scarcely a monarch or statesman or scholar of his age with whom he did not come in contact. Every people of Europe was represented among his disciples. He helped to shape the religious character of Churches and nations yet unborn. The Huguenots of France, the Protestants of Holland and Belgium, the Puritans and Independents of England and New England, the Presbyterians of Scotland and throughout the world, yea, we may say the whole Anglo-Saxon race, in its prevailing religious character and institutions, bears the impress of his genius, and shows the power and tenacity of his doctrines and principles of government."

Buckle, the English historian, wrote: "Calvinism is essentially democratic." De Tocqueville called it: "A democratic and republican religion." Doyle wrote: "It is the essential tendency of Calvinism to destroy all distinctions of rank and all claims to superiority which rest on wealth or political expediency."

Sir James Stephen, Professor of History in Cambridge, has written: "Calvin had established a spiritual republic having at the base of it four principles: (1) That the will of the people was the one legitimate source of power of the rulers; (2) That that power was most properly delegated by the people to their rulers by means of election in which every adult might vote; (3) That in the government of the Church clergy and laity are equal; (4) And

that Church and State are separate entities." ("Sommerville," page 14.)

In France, Calvinism gave birth to the Huguenot party. From the Huguenots, Professor Baird tells us, Montesquieu derived his idea of a government with executive, legislative and judicial departments. This he urged in his "L. Esprit de Loi."

Rufus Choate gave this tribute to our worthy subject: "In the reign of Mary from 1553 to 1558, a thousand learned Englishmen fled from the stake at home to the happier states of continental Protestantism. Of these, great numbers, I know not how many, came to Geneva. I ascribe to that five years in Geneva an influence which has changed the face of the world. I seem to myself to trace to it, as an influence on the English character, a new theology, new politics, another tone of character, the opening of another era of time and liberty. I seem to myself to trace to it the great civil war in England, the republican constitution framed in the cabin of the 'Mayflower,' the theology of Jonathan Edwards, the battle of Bunker Hill, the Independence of America." (Quoted in "Creed of Pres.," page 134.)

D'Aubigne wrote: "Calvin was the founder of the greatest of republics. The Pilgrims who left their country in the reign of James the First, and landing on the barren soil of New England, founded populous and mighty colonies, were his sons, his direct and legitimate sons; and that American nation which we have seen growing so rapidly boasts as its father the humble Reformer on the shores of Lake Leman." (*Ibid.*, page 132.)

Castelar wrote: "It was necessary for the republican movement of America that there should come a morality more austere than Luther's, the morality of Calvin, and a Church more democratic than the German, the Church of Geneva." (*Ibid.*, page 135.)

Schall wrote: "The principles of the Republic of the United States can be traced through the intervening link of Puritanism to Calvinism, which, with all its theological rigor has been the chief educator of manly characters and promoter of constitutional freedom in modern times."

Motley wrote: "To Calvinists, more than to any other class of men, the political liberties of England, Holland and America are due."

Taine says of them: "They founded Scotland, they founded the United States; at this day they are, by their descendants, founding Australia and colonizing the world."

Of America Brancroft wrote: "Again we are proud of the free states that fringe the Atlantic; the Pilgrims of Plymouth were Calvinists; the best influence in South Carolina came from the Calvinists in France; William Penn was the disciple of Huguenots; the ships from Holland that first brought colonists to Manhattan were filled with Calvinists. He that will not honor the memory and respect the influence of Calvin knows but little of the origin of American liberty." (Quoted in "Calvin Defended," page 199.)

It is significant too that Dr. Newman, the Baptist historian, closes his work with these words: "It remained for the Particular Calvinistic Baptists formed by secession

from a London Congregational church in 1633 to embody Antipedobaptism in a form that, when animated by the missionary spirit, has proved highly effective. In this form during the last century, its progress has been marvelous, and there seems to be no limit to its possible achievements." ("Hist. Antiped.," page 393.) Thus Baptists as well as Presbyterians owe to Calvin a large debt of gratitude.

Bancroft has written: "Again we boast of our common schools: Calvin was the father of popular education, the inventor of the system of free schools." America's free universities and public schools are to its national glory. Today three-fourths of our boys and girls are attending high school. Such American cities as New York and Chicago have more boys and girls in high schools than the entire country of Germany or France.

Thus when writers call Calvin the father of republics they indicate something of the debt we owe to him. His influence increased our blessings. The praise of this chapter may seem extravagant but it is not.

Cause of Calvin's Influence

His great influence was because he was a student of the Bible. In it he found two things: (1) A system of theology with the sovereignty of God as a center. (2) And a republican form of church government. This form is commonly known as Presbyterianism. But Calvin did not discover Presbyterianism. The apostles as well as we can tell taught it, and groups of Christians here and there held fast to it through all the weary centuries until the Reformation.

The Presbyterian form of church government had been introduced in Switzerland as early as 1528 when Calvin was but nineteen years old. The equality of the ministry had been taught by Zwingli, and when Calvin went to Geneva in Switzerland he found that Farel and Viret had commenced their reformation on Presbyterian principles and this led him to join them. ("Miller on Pres.," page 21.) But before this the equality of the ministry had been taught by the Waldenses, Petavius, Wycliffe, Huss, Luther, Calvin and others. But it was Calvin's wonderful ability, together with the age in which he lived, that made it possible for him to teach and establish the truths that affected governments.

He made men free and equal in church, and what they learned in the house of God they carried into politics and government. In ancient days there had been republics. Israel was one. In the year 1315 free government had been established in Switzerland. But men doubted the efficiency of this form. Aristotle, the great Greek scholar, had taught that there would never be a large republic on account of the awkwardness of this plan. So when Calvin wrote the idea had been abandoned and his systematic teaching called men back to the form.

Thus we say that Calvinism won the battle for freedom. Men imbued with his ideas fought the battles. In some places they succeeded; in others they failed. The great principles were crushed successfully by a persecuting Church in France and Spain. In Switzerland, Holland, England, Scotland they prevailed. The victory made America possible.

Therefore let no man revile the memory of Calvin. And let none think lightly of that great Church that to-

day teaches his system of theology and practices his form of church government, the Presbyterian.

Questions for Chapter V

1. Who was the founder of modern republics?
2. Which three of the authorities quoted impress you the most?
3. What made Calvin influential?
4. How did church government affect constitutional government?
5. Why did men think that large republics would not be practical?
6. Why do we say that Calvinism won the battle for freedom?

Chapter VI

The Westminster Assembly Wrote Our Creed

The six Westminster Standards that compose the creed of the Presbyterian Church were written in England in 1643 by the Westminster Assembly of Divines, which was called by the English Parliament to present to it a short statement of church doctrine and a form of church government that could be found in and proved by quotations from the Bible.

The history of the English Reformation that finally produced these Standards is too long to describe in this space. English reformers arose as far back as the thirteenth century. In later centuries, Henry the Eighth, the English King, quarreled with the Pope of Rome because he refused to grant his request for a divorce from Catherine of Aragon that would have permitted him to marry the beautiful Anne Boleyn. Henry was not to be thwarted in his sinful ways, however, and separated England from the Papacy and made himself the head of the English churches. After Henry the Eighth died other kings and queens reigned, some of whom favored the Catholics and some of whom preferred the Protestants. Finally the Protestants gained the upper hand.

The English Parliament met in September, 1640, and named November 5, 1643, as they day when government of the Church by archbishops and bishops should cease. Their resolution abolished Episcopacy and left each minister in charge of his church and without any supervising power over him. It was done, of course, with the thought

in mind that a new system of church government would soon be written and adopted.

But the men in Parliament were politicians and did not feel that they were sufficiently versed in the Bible and church matters to make the needed reforms. Very wisely then did parliament decide to call an assembly of Bible scholars to do this very important work. (See "Hodge's Com. Con. Faith," page 36.)

In obedience to the instructions of Parliament, the Assembly of Divines met July 1, 1643. It contained 121 ministers, 10 lords and 20 laymen. The ministers were chosen for their learning and not for their party beliefs or affiliations. Men of all shades of opinion as to church government were in the number—Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Independents, Erastians. It turned out that about twenty were friends of the established Church. The rest were Puritans. Very few Episcopalians accepted the invitation given them. Regardless of views all the members of the Assembly were members of the Church of England. All the ministers had received Episcopal ordination. At first there was not a single member of the Presbyterian Church in the body, although many, including the Puritans, were Presbyterian in their doctrinal views. These Puritans in fact had formed Presbyteries in London and other places after the pattern of the Reformed Churches in France, Switzerland and Holland. The strict Episcopalian delegates, that is, those who leaned toward the Roman Catholic Church, withdrew after the Scotch signed the Solemn League and Covenant in which the signers took oath to work for the destruction of popery.

A year after the body had begun its sessions six Presbyterian delegates come from Scotland. It is significant that

these never had the right to vote and the only part they took was in the discussions. Therefore it should be emphasized that the Confession and other Standards of the Presbyterian Church were first adopted by members of the Anglican Church. It is sometimes a matter of wonder why the Scotch delegates were in the Assembly at all. They were invited to unite that country more closely to England. And a Church that would be agreeable to all was wanted. But there was a barrier in Scotland's fear of popery. To overcome this barrier and win the Scotch, both Houses of Parliament adopted the Solemn League and Covenant. Then the six Scotch delegates took their seats. Let it also be borne in mind that this Assembly was only an advisory body. It did not have any legal authority to impose its findings. This could only be done by Parliament. In fact, the Assembly was strictly forbidden to meet by no less a person than the king himself. Regardless of him, the Assembly met because Parliament had called it.

Oath

The members began their work by taking a very strong oath: "I . . . do seriously promise and vow, in the presence of Almighty God, that in this Assembly of which I am a member, I will maintain nothing in point of doctrine, but what I believe to be most agreeable to the Word of God; nor in point of discipline but what I shall conceive to conduce most to the glory of God and to good and peace."

Before attempting to describe the Westminster Assembly, it would be well to describe the previous efforts that men had made to write creeds. The result will be the em-

phasis of the truth that the Westminster Assembly had many advantages in that it was not entering a new field but it had at hand many creeds that other scholars had written. These summaries of Christian doctrine were both numerous and able.

First it had the privilege of studying the ancient creeds and comparing them with the Bible. These were: (1) The Apostle's Creed. This was not written by the apostles but expresses in brief form what they believed and preached. Dr. Beattie has written: "Though not inspired it has a place beside the Ten Commandments and the Lord's Prayer in the literature of the early apostolic age." (Pres. Standards, 15.) (2) The Nicene Creed. This was the first symbol of a council of the Christian Church. It was first written in 325 A. D., changed in 381 A. D., and given its final and present form in 451 A. D. (3) The Athanasian Creed. The origin of this is obscure. It is popularly credited to Athanasius.

In addition to these three the Assembly of Divines had the use of many other creeds. There were the noted Catholic creeds. Foremost among these stands the Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent, produced in 1564. Then, the Tridentine Confession of Faith, consisting of the Nicene Creed and eleven other articles produced in 1564. Third, the Roman Catechism, written in 1566 and made of four parts treating of the Apostles' Creed, the Sacraments, the Ten Commandments, and the Lord's Prayer.

The Assembly also had many Reformation creeds and catechisms to guide it. Here the field was extensive, for the Reformation, both in its Lutheran and Reformed branches, was very fruitful in the production of creeds and confessions. The following are known as Lutheran

Confessions: (1) The Augsburg Confession which was prepared by Luther and Melancthon and produced in 1530. It was a strong refutation of the Roman Catholic theology. (2) Martin Luther wrote his two catechisms, the larger and the smaller, resembling the ones that we use, in 1529. (3) Luther drew up the Articles of Smalcald in 1536 to direct attention to defects in Romanism. (4) The Formula of Concord had been completed in 1577. There are twelve articles in the Formula, and they contain comprehensive statements upon such subjects as original sin, free will, justification, good works, the law, and the Gospel, the Lord's Supper, and the person of Christ. (See "Hodge's Com. Con. Faith," page 27.) (5) There were two other catechisms, the Saxon and the Wurtemburg, which were written about 1550.

The Assembly also had at its hands a number of Calvinistic creeds. Schaff states that there were about thirty of these. (1) Zwingli wrote a Confession of Fath in 1530. His Sixty-seven Articles were issued in 1572. The Bernese theses that had been written by Zwingli and others were issued about the same time. (2) The First and Second Confessions of Basle were framed in 1534. (3) The First and Second Helvetic Confessions were issued in 1536 and 1566. In many respects the Westminster Confession of Faith seems to follow the Second Helvetic Confession. (Beattie.) (4) The Consensus of Geneva was written in 1552. (5) The Gallican Confession was produced in 1559. (6) The French Confession was made in 1572. (7) The Belgic Confession was made in 1561. (8) The Heidelberg Catechism, the great creed of the Reformed Church of Germany, was produced in 1562 by Ursinus and Olvianus. It has since been issued in many languages. The order

follows Paul's Roman Letter. It treats of sin, the redemption of Christ and the Christian life. It contains a full explanation of the Apostle's Creed. (9) The Confession of Anhalt was written in 1581; (10) The Confession of Nassau in 1578; (11) The Confession of Bremen in 1598; (12) The Confession of Hesses in 1607. (13) The Waldensian Catechism was produced in 1498. (14) The Bohemian Catechism was written in 1521. (15) The Synod of Dort had issued its Canons that included the Five Points of Calvinism, unconditional election, original sin, particular redemption, invincible grace, and final perseverance of the saints, in the year 1619. (See Hodge's Com. Con. Faith bottom of page 28 and top of page 29.) (16) The Articles of the Church of England were produced in 1536, 1538, 1562, in the numbers ten articles at first, increased to forty-two, and reduced to thirty-nine. They are known as the "Thirty-Nine Articles." (17) The Irish Articles had been written by Usher in 1615. (18) John Gray wrote two Scotch Catechisms known as the larger and the smaller in 1581 and 1591. (19) Andrew Simpson and John Davidson produced Latin Catechisms before 1640.

It has perhaps been tedious to read this list containing allusions to thirty-one creeds, but we have mentioned only perhaps about a third of the creeds of Christendom that were issued and in use at the time the Westminster Assembly met to write our Confession. We have done this to show that our creed is not the product of one set of men alone, but that they had the advantage of numerous confessions and catechisms to guide them. They also had the theologies of many of the world's best thinkers, such as Augustine and Calvin. Thus we are warranted in say-

ing that the Westminster Confession of Faith is a digest of the world's best thought. Let all Presbyterians realize then that when men speak disparagingly of our creeds they stake individual criticisms against scholarship.

In addition to the above the Assembly met in a Bible reading age. The Bible was being studied all over England. The great questions of Popery, Protestantism, Calvinism, Arminianism, Unitarianism had all been presented and contended for. Each side had furnished its giant intellects. Thus the Assembly had the discussions of these men to guide it in its search for a Church based on God's Word.

This age was also one of learning. It was the day of Shakespeare and Francis Bacon. Guizot wrote: "Under whatever point of view we consider this era, we find its political, ecclesiastical and literary events more numerous, varied and important than in any of the preceding ages." ("Dev. of Eng. Lit.," by Welsh, Vol. I, page 265.)

Let no one think for a moment that the Westminster Assembly was composed of unlearned men. They were first among the scholars of the age. High tributes have been paid to the ability of these men by such authorities as John Milton, Baxter, Schaff, Stanley, Curry, and others. (See Creed of Presbyterians, 16 to 19.)

The first work before the Assembly was that of making a Directory of Church Government, Worship and Discipline. On the subject of Church Government there were three views. (1) One was the Presbyterian with which we are acquainted. (2) Another was the Independent or Congregational. Ten or twelve wise and scholarly men of the Assembly favored this form. The persecutions under Episcopacy had driven many to this extreme. They

were afraid of too much government, having already suffered too much from authority. The Independent group disputed every inch of ground with the Presbyterians. In the army they were strong and in Parliament they had many friends. Cromwell, Milton, Lord Manchester, and Vane adopted and supported this view. In opposition the Presbyterians advocated a restoration of the king with laws curtailing his power. (3) A third group in the Assembly was known as the Erastian. It was led by the very able Selden, and held that the work of the minister was to teach, preach, and administer the sacraments while religious discipline should be left to the civil magistrates.

Thus it was difficult to agree upon a form of church government. The Independents and Erastians often clashed with the others. But finally, near the close of 1644, the Form of Government was completed.

Then the Assembly began work on the Confession, which it completed and presented to Parliament December 3, 1646. Parliament returned it with the instruction that the "Assembly should attach marginal notes to prove every part of it by Scripture." It was sent to Parliament with the full proof-texts April 29, 1647. The "Shorter Catechism" which was modeled after the Confession of Faith was completed and sent to Parliament November 5, 1647; and the "Larger Cathechism" was completed April 14, 1648.

The Assembly had deliberated four and a half years when it completed the Confession of Faith and Catechisms. After this many of the members went to their homes. The Assembly continued as an advisory body to Parliament on church questions and as a court for the examination of candidates for the ministry until Febru-

ary 22, 1649. This was about three weeks after the beheading of King Charles. The Assembly had lasted five years, six months and twenty-two days, and had held 1,163 sessions. Thus we conclude that their work was not hastily done. We often wonder if those who find fault with this creed realize how long and carefully scholarly men worked upon it.

It is to be remembered that the Assembly contained both high and low Calvinists, and the language of the Confession is often the result of compromise between these two groups. "It can be fitted to the peculiar views of either party. This also enables the enemies of the Presbyterian Church to extract an offensive meaning from the words of her Standards."

In our day men find fault with the doctrines expressed in our Confession, but when it was written the Presbyterians and the Independents found no differences on these things. They were united on the doctrinal views or creedal statements of the Westminster Confession. This is easy to prove for when the Congregational or Independent Convention was called by Cromwell to meet at Savoy in London in 1658, this convention declared its approval of the doctrinal part of the Confession and Catechisms of the Westminster Assembly, and conformed its own deliverance, the Savoy Confession, very nearly to these. In fact many of the Independents used our Standards in preference to their own.

We do not have the space to tell of the rise to power of Oliver Cromwell. But a few important things force their attention upon us. Cromwell organized the most remarkable army in history. It never lost a battle. It was made up of religious men, most of whom were Puritans. Pro-

fanity and vice were unknown in its ranks. A woman could walk through the tent aisles at midnight unattended and never hear an unethical word. The soldiers might be seen, some reading their Bibles, some singing Psalms, and here and there a group listening to a storyteller or a preacher.

But jealousy sprang up between the army and the Parliament. The army was also jealous of Scotland and inasmuch as it was Presbyterian to the core and the army preferred Independency in church government this added fuel to the fire. At this time Parliament unwisely passed several rash measures to restrain heresy. A loud clamor for toleration arose. The army marched to London and expelled all the Presbyterian members of Parliament, leaving sixty who favored the Independents. This group of sixty was called the Rump Parliament. Cromwell became Protector and ruled for twelve years as with a rod of iron, but with justice, and his reign was a prosperous period in the history of England. He had his faults, but nevertheless he was one of the world's great men. After his death, his son, Richard, abdicated and the Long Parliament met again and established the Presbyterian Church. This Parliament adjourned in a lawful way after setting a date for the election of a new Parliament. Then Charles the Second was recalled from exile and became king. He re-established Episcopacy. A severe act of uniformity in 1662 drove two thousand ministers, mostly Presbyterians, from their churches. Persecution in Scotland was even more severe than in England. Charles the Second was followed by James the Second, a cruel tyrant. Thus twenty-eight years passed. Lord Jeffries played the judge, and Claverhouse's Dragoons broke up all attempt to wor-

ship. England immediately looked about for a legitimate king to head a revolution and drive out the degenerate Stuart family. The people invited William of Orange, a Dutch Presbyterian, to come to England. He came and was elevated to the throne by what is known as the Bloodless Revolution or the Glorious Revolution of 1688. James the Second fled to France. In Ireland the Catholics rebelled in support of James, but they were suppressed at the battle of Boyne. The metal of the Irish Protestants was shown in the famous siege of Londonderry. When William took the English throne an act of toleration was passed that gave to all worshipers equal rights, and civil and religious liberty became the heritage of all.

Questions for Chapter VI

1. When and by whom was our creed written?
2. Why did Parliament call Bible scholars to write a system of church government?
3. Name the groups in the Westminster Assembly.
4. When and why did the Scotch delegates come to the Assembly?
5. Describe the oath taken by all delegates.
6. How many creeds did they have to guide them?
7. What kind of men composed the Assembly?
8. When Parliament returned the Confession, what request or order was attached to it?
9. How long did the Assembly last?
10. Did the Presbyterians and Independents differ in their views on doctrinal matters?
11. What great man arose to govern England?
12. Describe the effect of the jealousies.
13. Who was William of Orange?
14. What blessing did his reign bring?

Chapter VII

The Presbyterians Who Came to America

The Dutch from Holland, the Huguenots from France, the Scotch-Irish from Ireland, the Scotch and the English who came to America in colonial days were largely Calvinistic in their faith. They believed in the right of the congregation to govern by appointing elders to represent it and carry out its wishes. Many of the early Churches were Presbyterian although they did not carry that name.

Our study of the Presbyterian Church takes us first to Virginia, the early history of which surpasses that of all other colonies in the elements of heroism and romance. The first lasting English colony was planted at Jamestown in 1607, and here was the first representative assembly in America. Those writers and patriots who make Plymouth an earlier settlement than Jamestown are in error. Without Jamestown there would have been no Plymouth. The names of John Smith and Pocahontas and others are connected with this early effort. Virginia prospered and by the time of the Revolution was the strongest and richest of the colonies. It took the leading part in the great struggle and gave to the period such names as Washington, Jefferson, Madison and Patrick Henry.

When Sir Thomas Dale, a deputy governor, came to the Virginia colony in 1611 he brought with him a Puritan minister named Alexander Whitaker. Whitaker organized his church on the Presbyterian plan. One of his worthy ambitions was to found a college but he was drowned in 1617. However, his purpose bore fruit when in 1620, a university was decreed for Henrico about ten miles from Richmond. A beginning was actually made,

a teacher was employed, and funds were subscribed but the Indian massacre of 1622 destroyed all traces of town and college. (Bassett, 153.) If this college had not been destroyed it would have been the first in America. It is noteworthy that Presbyterians were its promoters.

The Puritans were Presbyterians. In Virginia after 1662, they were persecuted and driven here and there. When Francis Makemie, frequently called the founder of the Presbyterian Church in America, came to Virginia in 1684, he gathered a congregation from the scattered Puritans of Norfolk county and preached to them a year. When Makemie left another Presbyterian preacher named Josias Mackie took his place and remained until death called him in 1716. Dr. Edward Mack has written of Makemie: "He organized Presbyterian churches in Accomac county and the lower counties of Maryland, gathering into these churches the surviving and heroic Puritans of early Virginia days." It seems that Makemie organized his first churches at Rehoboth and Snow Hill in Maryland in the year 1684. He was a sort of a circuit rider and went as far south as South Carolina and north to Delaware, New York and Boston.

By the year 1700 there were at least five Presbyterian preachers here and several more Scotch Presbyterians were pastors of Congregational churches in New England. Many more Presbyterian preachers came in the few years immediately after 1700.

In 1707 Makemie was imprisoned at Newtown, Long Island, for preaching in the state of New York without a license. He died in Virginia in 1708, having been a leader in the Presbyterian Church for eighteen years. Without exaggeration we may pronounce him a great man. Those

who read Foote's "Sketches of Virginia," a work that describes graphically the efforts of Presbyterians to secure religious liberty in that section, will not forget such men as Francis Makemie, Samuel Davies and James Waddell. The reader will also realize somewhat that many mighty efforts were made to separate Church and State and secure religious liberty long before Thomas Jefferson came on the stage of action.

There is an interesting story connected with the Presbyterian Church in the early years of Virginia history. In 1671, during the administration of Governor Berkley, the preachers of the Established Church were an ordinary lot. There were forty-eight parishes and the preachers were well paid by the authorities, but these preachers were of the worst sort, and the good people of Hanover county became dissatisfied with the Church. They began to gather at the home of a man named Joshua Morris, where they read such religious literature as Whitefield's sermons or Luther's writings or worthy thoughts from the pens of other pious souls. Soon the house became too small and the worshipers built what they called Morris' Reading House. This growth aroused the opposition of the Established Church and Morris and his friends were ordered to appear before Governor Gooch in Williamsburg. Dr. Mack continues the story in these words: "On the way to the capitol the Providence of God put a copy of the Westminster Confession of Faith into the hands of one member of the party. When they read it they found that it expressed with accuracy the views of God's Word at which they in their meetings had already arrived. When the Governor asked them the name of the sect to which they belonged, they did not know, but handing him the Con-

fession of Faith they said, 'This book contains our faith.' Governor Gooch, a Scotchman, recognized the book as a Scotch edition of the Confession. 'Why,' said he, 'you men are Presbyterians. Now return to your homes and conduct yourselves properly, and no man shall molest you'." ("Union Seminary Review," April, 1924, page 303.) These men returned and continued to worship God in their own way. In 1743 a Presbyterian preacher named William Robinson came to them and preached for four days. Crowds came and many were converted. In gratitude they wanted to pay him, but Robinson was a man of means and refused their offer. But they slipped a large roll of bills in his saddle-bags. He dedicated it to educating a young minister with the hope that he might come to Virginia. Samuel Davies, a poor young man, became the beneficiary of this gift—Virginia's first contribution to Christian education. In 1747, at the age of twenty-three, Davies came to this people. He was of humble origin, but of brilliant mind. Unfortunately, tuberculosis had fastened its grip upon him, and his life was destined to close at an early age.

For eleven years he preached in Virginia. "He was a man of consuming missionary spirit, and preached regularly in six or seven counties. Byrd church in Goochland, and Olivet in New Kent, grew up from his ministry. He was a great student of the Word and fed his flock from its pages. He was a wise organizer and his work remains to this day. He was orator and poet and master of beautiful English, so that his sermons are read to this day as masterpieces of sublime thought and noble expression."

When Jonathan Edwards, president of Princeton, died in 1758, Samuel Davies was elected to succed him, and he

gave this institution a scholastic prestige such as neither Edwards nor Burr were able to win for it. But Davies' days at Princeton were numbered. He died in 1761 at the early age of thirty-six years. His life had been brief but wonderful. It is thrilling to think of what he did in service and for immortality.

When only twenty-seven years old, he appeared before Governor Berkley and his council to argue for religious toleration. He excelled the lawyers of the Established Church in debating the issue and won his case. On this occasion he was confronted by no less a personage than Randolph, the Attorney General of Virginia.

During the eleven years that Davies preached in Virginia Patrick Henry came to his services. Henry was a youth at the time and his parents and relatives were members of the church. He revered Davies and considered him the greatest orator of the times. In later years, when the lips of Patrick Henry aroused the people, was it not the soul of Samuel Davies that thrilled ears and moved hearts through the one to whom he had so often preached?

James Waddell, called the "missionary of the foot hills of Virginia," lighted his torch from the fires that burned in the soul of Davies. One of American history's beautiful stories is the description that William Wirt, Attorney General of the United States, gave of a communion service in Waddell's church near Gordonsville, Va. At the time Waddell was old and blind, but his voice was eloquent with feeling, and the last words of his discourse, "Socrates died like a philosopher but Jesus Christ died like a God" made an everlasting impression upon William Wirt.

One other influence exerted by Samuel Davies must be

told. Archibald Alexander became his son-in-law and went from Virginia to found Princeton Seminary.

It may seem to the reader that we have drifted away from our theme to heap praise upon Samuel Davies. But everything said in praise of him is a tribute to the Presbyterian Church that he loved and served. This great Church moulded his wonderful talents and directed his remarkable life, a life so brief and yet so grand that every student of American colonial history who meets him in these early day accounts is made better by the contact.

A Presbyterian colony was started at Salem, Mass., in 1625 under Roger Conant. This colony co-operated cordially with the Pilgrims or Independents who had landed at Plymouth in 1620. The two systems of church government were not distinct in this country in the early days. Both were alike in theology, and usually some leading spirit turned the churches to Presbyterianism or Congregationalism. In New England the leaders drifted more and more to Congregationalism, while farther South, where the settlers were from Scotland and Ireland rather than England, the leaders went to Presbyterianism.

To Presbyterians from Holland belong the high honors of founding the first Christian church of any denomination. The place was New Amsterdam; the leader was Jonas Michaelius; the date was 1628.

Rev. Richard Denton came from England in 1630 with part of his congregation, and settled in Massachusetts from whence he was driven because of his Presbyterian views, and went to Hempstead, Long Island. In 1656 Presbyterians, led by his two sons, bought a tract of land from the Indians and founded Jamaica. The Hempstead church probably went out of existence about 1729, as there is no

notice of it after that date. But the history of the Jamaica church is unbroken to the present day, and it is one of the oldest churches in this country.

Francis Doughty came to Massachusetts in 1637, and was driven away for practicing infant baptism. He went among the Dutch in New York. He was the first Presbyterian preacher to preach in New York City, and he was there from 1643 to 1648. Then he was driven farther south and went to Maryland to his brother-in-law, Governor Stone. To make a long story short, opposition hurt the Presbyterian Church in New York City, and the first Presbyterian church was not organized there until 1717. Let none think that our Presbyterian ancestors escaped persecution when they came to America.

Our Baptist friends, whom we love and of whom we think in high terms, have often been misled by their enthusiastic historians to believe that they, more than any other Church, should be credited with winning the right to worship God according to the dictation of conscience without molestation from the civil powers. For instance, a noted Baptist wrote in 1892: "Baptists first announced the principle of religious liberty in Switzerland; Baptists first advocated it in England; a Baptist first established it in America." ("Christ in Creation," page 209.) This is not the proper place to discuss the first two claims, but we will present some facts that affect the third. The Baptist claim for America is based on Roger Williams, a preacher in the Church of England, who came to America as one of the leaders of a Puritan colony that arrived at Boston in 1631. When he grew up in England, the principles of religious freedom taught by Wycliffe, and the seeds of political liberty planted during the latter years of the reign of

Elizabeth and the early part of the reign of James were springing up in the form of new opinions and institutions. Many of the Puritans had already asserted that ministers of the Gospel ought to be supported by voluntary contributions of the people, and that civil powers had no right to make or enforce church laws. (Art. N. Amer. Review 1845, by Professor Gammel, of Brown University.) Such then were the currents of thought in Roger Williams' day. Coming to the man himself we find that this great character had some ideas that were good and some that were strange. He was the first and strongest advocate of soul liberty in early America. He nobly held that Indian lands should not be taken without paying for them. But he did participate in the wrong of Indian slavery. He wanted women to wear veils in church and opposed popish symbols to the point where he wanted the cross omitted from the king's colors. But with his eccentricities he was a man of benevolence, forgiveness, and devotion to truth, virtue and liberty, and his descendants have good reasons to be proud of his worthy efforts.

Because of the things he advocated he was driven away from Salem to Plymouth. He returned to Salem again and was banished in the mid-winter of 1635. In 1636 he founded Providence. In 1639 he fell in with some Anabaptists and was immersed, and with ten others founded the first Baptist denomination in America. It is rather an astounding fact but nevertheless true that he remained in this Church only four months, becoming dissatisfied with his baptism which he thought lacked apostolic succession. Withdrawing from the Baptist denomination he afterwards remained outside of all church connections and became known as a Seeker or an Independent, but con-

tinued to preach. He made two trips to England, and in 1654 he enjoyed the friendship of Oliver Cromwell, John Milton and other prominent Puritans. He died in Providence in March or April, 1684.

The Baptists have said much in praise of Roger Williams, and this has all been appropriate, but the question rings in our minds, was he a loyal Baptist? A study of his life indicates that he was more a Puritan than a Baptist, and that the Baptists stretch things considerably in attaching the importance they do to one who was a Baptist for only four months. He lost faith in his immersion because it lacked the element of apostolic succession and forsook the Church, and though he lived for forty-five years after this he did not return to the Church. His decision against it was final and conclusive. His connection with the Baptist denomination was so brief that some of those who have written about him do not mention it.

First Presbytery

Makemie and six other Presbyterian ministers organized the first Presbytery in Philadelphia in 1706. By 1716 it had seventeen ministers. These organized the first Synod in Philadelphia in 1717. In 1729 the Westminster Standards were adopted. In 1775, before the Revolutionary War, the Synods of New York and Philadelphia had eleven Presbyteries and one hundred and thirty-two ministers. In many places in New Jersey, Virginia, North Carolina and other colonies the Presbyterians were numerous. And these Presbyterians stood for a free Church in a free State. As early as 1729 the Synod of Philadelphia expressed in strong and certain terms the Presbyterian belief in the separation

of Church and State. Again in 1743 and on through the years the same principle was advocated. But let us not think such ideas originated in America. Long before this they had been urged by Presbyterians in the Old World.

Questions for Chapter VII

1. Where did the early American Presbyterians come from?
2. Tell of Alexander Whitaker in Virginia.
3. When did Makemie come to America?
4. Tell the story of Joshua Morris.
5. Tell of Samuel Davies.
6. What noted orator came in his boyhood to hear Davies?
7. When and where did Conant found his colony?
8. Who was the first Presbyterian preacher in New York City?
9. Describe the work of Roger Williams.
10. What church did he join?
11. Describe his later course.
12. How many Presbyterian ministers were in the synods of New York and Philadelphia in 1775?
13. What did they stand for?

Chapter VIII

The Presbyterians Who Came to America

The story of the Scotch Reformation is closely connected with John Knox who sat at the feet of Calvin in Geneva. This John Knox was one of history's mighty men. F. W. Boreham, the Australian essayist and preacher, has written these excellent words about him: "Some men are born not to die. It is their prerogative to live; they come on purpose. A thousand deaths will not lay them in the grave. . . Among such deathless men John Knox stands out conspicuously. When in Edinburgh it is impossible to believe that John Knox lived four hundred years ago. He is so very much alive today that it seems incredible that he was living even then. The people will show you his grave in the middle of the road, and the meager epitaph on the tombstone will do its feeble best to convince you that his voice has been silent for centuries; but you will skeptically shake your head and move away. For as you walk about the noble and romantic city, John Knox is everywhere. He is the most ubiquitous man you meet. You come upon him at every street corner. Here is the house in which he dwelt; there is the church in which he preached; at every turn you come upon places that are haunted by him still. The very stones vibrate with the strident accents of his voice; the walls echo to his footsteps. I was introduced to quite a number of people in Edinburgh; but I blush to confess that I have forgotten them all—all but John Knox. It really seems to me, looking back upon that visit, that I met John Knox somewhere or other every five minutes. I could hear the ring of his voice; I could see the flash of his eye; I could feel the impress of his huge and com-

manding personality. The tomb in the middle of the road notwithstanding, John Knox is indisputably the most virile force in Scotland at this hour. I dare say that, like me, he sometimes catches sight of that tomb in the middle of the road. If so, he laughs—as he could laugh—and strides defiantly on. For John Knox was born in 1505 and, behold, he liveth and abideth forever." (Written in 1920). We hesitate to pass from this wonderful description to our own poor and halting style, but we must pass on. John Knox led a checkered life as did all the reformers. He was converted by studying the Bible and reading the writings of Augustine; he was a galley slave in France from 1547 to 1549; he was freed by English interposition; he became chaplain to Edward VI of England in 1551. When Bloody Mary was made queen he fled to Geneva in 1553. Here he received the strong Calvinistic impression that enabled him later to lay the foundations of the Scotch Church and write its system of doctrine which is thoroughly Presbyterian.

The Scotch Presbyterians were to endure many persecutions. But it is a glorious story. There are many incidents. Who has not heard of Janet Geddes? On July 23, 1637, an attempt was made to force a Service Book on the Scotch Church. A great congregation gathered in St. Giles church, Edinburgh. The dean began to read when Janet Geddes arose and picked up the stool on which she had been sitting and threw it at the dean. Other things followed. The little clasp Bibles flew thick and fast. In vain did the bishop try to quiet the angry congregation. Charles, the English king, was raving mad, but the Scots were as strongly in earnest. They humbly petitioned him to reconsider his command and not try to force Episcopal

liturgy upon them. He would not listen. On the first of March, 1638, Scotch nobles, peasants and ministers met in Greyfriar's church to sign a Solemn League and Covenant. It was read. There were no objections. Who would sign first? A pause followed. Then the Earl of Sutherland, the oldest man present, with a hand trembling with age signed his name. In quick succession others followed. A ringing shout greeted each one. Some repeated the words "till death." Now and then one would cut a gash in his arm and sign with blood and write under the name "until death." Carlyle has written: "A riot in the High church at Edinburgh spread into a universal battle, a struggle over all these realms, and there came after fifty years' struggle what we call the glorious Revolution." By the great covenant to defend the crown rights of Jesus Christ the bold men of Greyfriar's won for themselves and their colleagues and successors the ever fadeless name "Covenanters." We have heard men malign it, but upon reading the history as written by impartial men we have found these detractors uninformed on the true facts.

Charles came with an army to conquer the Presbyterians. "On a bright June day, on a low, long hill at Dunse-law, stretched out in the segment of a circle, lies the army of the Covenanters. The summit of the hill bristles with forty field pieces; below cluster the tents; twelve thousand Covenanters are there. Before each captain's tent is planted a banner-staff bearing the Scotch colors, the national arms, and in golden letters the words: 'For Christ's Crown and Covenant.' This was the sight Charles beheld as his army came face to face with his Presbyterian subjects."

According to the verdict of history these Covenanters saved England from despotism. The Presbyterian system of church government gave the Scotch a decided advantage in their struggle against tyranny. It can only be appreciated by contrasting the struggle in Scotland with the efforts of the Puritans in England. In Englnad the Bishops had great power and this they did not have in Scotland. The English bishops went so far as to forbid preaching and reading in private houses. They even dared to defy Parliament. Archbishop Laud once summoned one of the chief justices of England to appear before him and receive instructions as to how he should make court decisions.

The martyr age of Scotland began in 1660. According to the smallest figure eighteen thousand died for their religion. During the trying days many Scotch came to America. "A colony settled at Port Royal, S. C., but afterwards moved. Many settled in Charleston where the old First church is popularly called the Scotch church. There was at a very early date a Scotch church in New York. In 1685 many settled at Woodbridge, N. J. Large settlements were made on the Cape Fear river in North Carolina, mainly just before 1745. The remarkable Black River Settlements in South Carolina were made by the Scotch." (Dr. J. M. Wells.)

Emigration From Ireland

We will disregard those early religious elements that came to Britain, Scotland and Ireland in the first century of the Christian Era, and also Saint Patrick who has been claimed by Romanists, Episcopalians and Presbyterians, and note those developments that followed the rebellion

of two powerful chieftains who later fled into exile and whose lands were confiscated by the English King James and given by him to Scotch and English settlers. Ulster, the Protestant part of Ireland, originated in this action.

A seventeenth century writer has called these ancestors of the Scotch-Irish people "scum of both nations," who sought to escape from human justice, and who were given to atheism, fighting and murder. But some good people came in the number. These, according to Episcopal authority, were imbued with a strong contempt for bishops, liturgy, and ceremony, and all forms of worship used in the Church of England. The rulers of the Episcopate were at a loss what to do with such people, "some full of devilishness and the rest full of Puritanism." They decided to send them Presbyterian preachers from Scotland. Edward Brice went in 1613. Robert Cunningham went in 1615, and others of high character and earnest spirit followed. In this way the Scotch-Irish Presbyterians arose. A great revival occurred in 1625. Many were converted. Persecution followed. In 1636 one hundred and forty of these people built a ship of 150 tons, named it the "Eagle Wing," and started for America but were forced back by the sea. In 1641 the Catholics instituted what is known as the Irish Rebellion. The purpose was to destroy all the Protestants of Ireland. Professor Kurtz has written: "The conspirators rushed from all sides into the houses of the Protestants, murdered the inhabitants, and drove them naked and helpless from their homes. Many thousands died on the roadside of hunger and cold. In other places they were driven in crowds into the rivers and drowned, or into empty houses which were burned over them. The number of those who suffered is variously estimated from

40,000 to 400,000." ("Church History," by Kurtz, Vol. 3, page 7.) Professor R. C. Reed gives this description: "This rebellion or uprising was instigated by Catholic priests, and the decree of extermination was issued against all Protestants. That was a cruel age, and many are the thrilling stories of bloody horrors which its history has transmitted to us. Of them all, not even excepting the massacre of St. Bartholomew, this Irish Rebellion stands out peerless in the utter fiendishness of its atrocities. The degraded savages, going forth with the benediction from priestly lips resting on their hearts to make them insensible to appeals for pity, illustrated as few savages have ever illustrated the indescribable, unutterable measure of diabolical cruelty of which human nature is capable. They dashed out the brains of infants before the eyes of their mothers; they threw some into boiling pots and others into filthy ditches. Merely to gratify their brutal instincts, they gouged out the eyes, cut off the ears and hands, cut out the tongues, and otherwise mutilated the bodies of their helpless victims. They buried some alive, roasted some over slow fires and devised every conceivable way to inflict shame and pain on those for whom they accounted death too gracious a boon. Their worst deeds were of such a nature that decency will not permit them to be unveiled. No discrimination was made between Episcopalians and Presbyterians, between Englishmen and Scotchmen; their object was to sweep all away." ("Hist. Pres. Ch.," page 179.)

It is pleasant to think that we live in a more humane age than this, and that our American Catholics are far above such crimes. But in portions of the world where conditions are primitive the Catholic Church has resorted

to measures even in the present day that are beneath the dignity of that great and wonderful Church and the Saviour they love and serve.

Oliver Cromwell took a fearful revenge for this crime. He captured two cities by storm and had all the citizens cut down without distinction. In nine months Ireland was reconquered. But after Cromwell died persecution came again. In 1690 the Scotch-Irish began coming to America. It has been estimated that five hundred thousand came in the following fifty years. In 1718 Cotton Mather wrote: "We are comforted with great numbers of the oppressed brethren coming from the North of Ireland. The glorious Providence of God, in the removal hither of so many of a desirable character, hath doubtless very great intentions in it." ("Presbyterians," by Hays, page 78.) The Scotch-Irish came through Philadelphia into the Cumberland Valley of Pennsylvania. They went into the Valley of the Potomac and into the Valley of Virginia. They settled Piedmont North Carolina, and, joining others who came through Charleston, they settled upper South Carolina. They moved steadily westward and became the decisive folk in conquering America's great unexplored spaces. Theodore Roosevelt, in his scholarly work, "The Winning of the West," pays many merited tributes to these hardy people. From them, perhaps, more than from any other people, have come the Presbyterian churches of America.

In conclusion: "It may be safely said that the Presbyterian Church of Ireland is one of the most thoroughly orthodox, consistently conservative, and healthfully active

of all the Churches in the great brotherhood of like faith and order." ("Hist. Pres. Ch.," Reed, page 204.)

Emigration From England

The name Puritan is one to dream about. It was a general term that included the Low Church Episcopalians, Presbyterians and Independents. These advocated changing the service of the Church from Latin as in the Catholic Church to English, and rejected the confessional and the mass. In a word they wanted to purify church worship by taking away the unbiblical things that had been added by men. Students from Calvin's University taught his views in England, and this increased the number of Puritans. During the long reign of Queen Elizabeth this party grew. The Queen had a passion for peace at any price and let all her subjects go their own way. But persecution came and many Puritans went to America. The Stuart Kings sent four fools to the English throne. They were:

James the First, the learned fool. 1603.
Charles the First, the pious fool. 1625.
Charles the Second, the wicked fool.
James the Second, the fanatical fool.

All of these were both false and foolish. James the First hated Presbyterianism because he was afraid of its influence for liberty. It made people independent and he wanted to reign without the annoyance of having his acts questioned. Charles the First was tyrannical and became a persecutor, and was finally executed. The Long Parliament convened and the Westminster Assembly did its

work and produced the Confession, the Catechisms, and the Form of Government that have since been used by Presbyterian Churches throughout the world. Then Cromwell came into power and tried to start a republic. But his subjects did not know how to rule themselves, and Cromwell became absolute in his authority, although his reign was equitable and therefore admirable. When he died he left a leaderless, constitutionless, child-like people, and the kings returned. Charles the Second was wicked and James the Second was a fanatic. Fortunately William and Mary came into power by a bloodless revolution and brought freedom. Dr. Wells has summed the immigration epoch to America in these words: "Meanwhile the stream of Puritan emigration started for America. It started under Elizabeth and flowed strongly under Bloody Mary. The Pilgrims were not Presbyterians but many of the Puritans were. Many came to Connecticut. We find them on the Elizabeth river in Virginia free until 1630 and then persecuted. They were on Long Island and on the eastern shore of Maryland. Wherever they settled outside of New England they were or became Presbyterians."

We have mentioned the principal groups that came to these shores. All these groups were Calvinistic in their religious views, and Calvinistic in their ideas of church government. Even the Independents, many of whom became Congregationalists or Baptists, were deeply influenced by Calvin's teachings. We think all will agree that the dignity and soberness of Calvinism elevated the fanatical tendencies of the Anabaptists and made possible the Baptist denomination of the present. And to our own Church should be given the credit of training and molding the men and women who were the sinew and

muscle of the colonies. May the noble heritage challenge us to perpetuate the influences that have been so beneficial to mankind.

Questions for Chapter VIII

1. What does Boreham say of John Knox?
2. What made Janet Geddes famous?
3. Describe the signing of the Solemn League and Covenant.
4. What words were written on the Covenanter banner?
5. What effect did persecution have on the Covenanters?
6. Tell how the Scotch-Irish arose.
7. Describe the Irish Rebellion.
8. Where did the Scotch-Irish settle in America?
9. Who has paid them many tributes?
10. Who were the Puritans?

Chapter IX

The Presbyterian Church in Colonial Days

The Presbyterian Church of colonial days in the United States received its members from seven countries of the Old World as follows: Switzerland, France, Germany, Holland, Ireland, England and Wales. It was emigration from these countries that furnished the hardy souls that carved out this empire of the west. Most of them came to escape religious persecution.

Dr. John M. Wells has compared the Presbyterian Church of America to a great river fed by small streams that run back to the countries of Europe. One stream runs back to Switzerland, the land of Zwingli and Calvin. Another runs back to France where the Presbyterians were persecuted and martyred by the thousands. Another stream runs back to the Rhine Provinces of Germany, which were ravaged by Louis XIV in 1689, and thousands of German Presbyterians were forced to flee the country. Another runs back to Holland, the little land of dykes, that fought the long war with Philip the Second of Spain. Another goes back to Scotland, a land that has long been a cradle of liberty. Another goes back to Ulster in Ireland, and another to England and Wales. We will give a brief account of the circumstances and persecution that drove great men and women from these lands to seek to worship God in their own way in America.

The effective and enduring home of the Reformation was in Geneva, Switzerland. Many events, however, occurred before Geneva came into prominence. Years before in 1517 Luther had been stirred to action by the sale of

indulgences by one named Tetzel, an outcast monk, appointed by the Pope of Rome to raise money avowedly for building St. Peter's Cathedral in Rome but really to fill the Pope's treasury.

Previously Tetzel had been sentenced to be drowned for adultery, but the Elector of Saxony interceded for him and he was released from prison to do this piece of work. Six years before this Luther, who was a priest, had made a pilgrimage to Rome. On his first view of the city he dropped to his knees and said: "I greet thee, Holy Rome." But he was thoroughly disgusted with the immorality and frivolity that he saw among the clergy. He withdrew from the city and on the return journey a voice seemed to repeat to him the words: "The just shall live by faith." He studied divinity, and following the writings of Augustine, a great fourth century theological writer, he became a reformer. At the time Luther had no idea of reforming the government of the Church but only its doctrines and practices. He thought the Germans were too unlearned and rough to have church government entrusted to them. Zwingli was Luther's contemporary and the speculative theologian of the Reformation. He was killed in battle.

Farel and Calvin in Geneva gave the Reformation the direction that led to success. Calvin had been forced to flee from the University of Paris, and as he passed through Geneva Farel prevailed on him to remain. In fact he went so far as to call down God's wrath upon him if he did not. In Geneva, Calvin started a university. Eight hundred students came the first year. They were taught a pure Pauline or Augustinian theology and returned to their lands to preach these doctrines. The influence of these men cannot be measured. I think it is true to state

that when all the Reformation influences have been studied men would be wise to conclude that this university was the mighty factor that made victory possible and permanent. The young men who came were choice souls, impelled by a desire to search the Scriptures, find the truth, propagate it, and rid the Church of the blemishes that were discrediting it before the world. These men preached and taught, and in hundreds of instances sealed their views with their blood. The Pope called Geneva "the Wasp's Nest," and asked the Duke of Alva who was going to Holland with an army of ten thousand soldiers, and whose route led him close by, to turn aside and destroy this hotbed of heresy. But Switzerland was a mountainous country and his army would have been handicapped and likely ineffective. In colonial days many Swiss immigrants came to America. The first to come settled in the Mohawk valley in Pennsylvania. This was between 1690 and 1720. Later, Swiss settled along the Neuse river in North Carolina, and from 1730 to 1750 bodies of them went to South Carolina.

Emigration From France

The Reformation continued to spread in France after Calvin was forced to flee from the University of Paris in 1536. From Switzerland, his new residence, he sent mighty influences back to France. Hundreds of young men educated in his seminary came into France and preached a pure Gospel. Thus arose the Huguenots. Their first church was organized in Paris in 1555. The peculiar name may have come from the oath that bound them together, or from a traditional King Hugo. The

story of this Huguenot Church is one of the most thrilling and tragic in history. Persecution and blood laid a heavy hand upon these noble souls. From 1515 to 1547, Francis the First tried to crush them. The Inquisition was established in 1535 and conducted with terrible effect. Blood flowed in torrents. Calvin barely escaped. From 1547 to 1559 Henry the Second increased the fury of the persecution. In the midst of it the Reformed Synod courageously met in Paris in 1559 and made the Gallic Confession. At this time there were over 2,150 churches in the General Assembly of France. Rapid growth made from one-fourth to one-half of France Huguenot by 1571. There were many great churches. The one in Orleans had 7,000 members. Then came the terrible massacre of St. Bartholomew in 1572. Anywhere from 10,000 to 100,000 Huguenots were massacred. The Seine river near Paris was choked with dead bodies. It is hard to think of the startling fact that Pope Gregory XIII and Philip II of Spain both approved this massacre. The wars between the Huguenots and the Catholics went on. Victory rested first with one and then with the other, until the Huguenots won toleration by the sword. In 1598 the Edict of Nantes was passed to give them relief. But during the seventy-five years of its continuance it was never enforced. The hand of oppression was never relaxed. All the time the Huguenots bravely bore their crosses. Finally in 1685 Louis IV revoked the Edict of Nantes that partially shielded the Huguenots. The destruction of every chapel was ordered. Every minister was ordered to leave the kingdom in fifteen days. Then the Huguenots began going to other countries. Even laws of expatriation did not

stop the exodus. They went to enrich Germany, Holland, England and America. Most of them were of the thrifty middle class. Nearly all were men of some means. Among them were skilled workers of various trades. There were potters, weavers, hatters, leather workers. Thirty thousand silk weavers left the one city of Tours. Nine thousand went out of Lyons. Thus France lost 500,000 of its very best citizens and it paid the penalty in later years with a weakened citizenship. Louis IV knocked the props from under the French throne. But time was required to affirm the folly of his course. Many Huguenots went through Holland and the British Isles, residing in the latter for about thirty years where the English language became their common speech. Thence they came to America and laid the foundations of some of the very best families in the North and South. Dr. Wells has written: "Many settled in and around Charleston. Many more settled on the James in Virginia. They had a church in Boston and another in New York. They brought a strain of brightness that has lightened the somewhat stern and somber nature of our people. Some of the finest men in our Church have borne Huguenot names." It is remarkable that out of the fires of persecution they should have brought "a strain of brightness," but such is always the result of the glorious Gospel of Jesus Christ. As we read the story of these Huguenots it becomes our regret that passing years are taking America gradually away from the fine influences brought by these knights of true religion. God grant that their influence may never entirely die out.

Emigration From Germany

Most of Germany was deeply affected by Luther's teaching and became Lutheran. But Calvinism went from Switzerland into the Rhine valley and there the churches became Reformed or Presbyterian. The two words carry identical meanings. But when Louis IV destroyed this part of Germany in 1689, the fleeing Calvinists or German Presbyterians went to Holland and England. Later many came to America. Permit us to quote Dr. Wells again: "In 1709, through the help of Queen Anne, one body of 5,000 came to Pennsylvania and settled in the valley of the Mohawk. Others came later to Western Maryland, the valley of Virginia and part of Western North Carolina. A fine sturdy stream were these Presbyterian Germans. They have in the main been absorbed into our Presbyterian population, and have become a fine strain in our Church."

Emigration From Holland

The Reformation in Holland moved in three waves. From 1518 to 1531 it was largely influenced by the Lutheran Reformation. Persecution crushed this. Then from 1531 to 1560 the Anabaptists were influential. In the beginning they were guilty of many fanatical excesses. Then it is probable that Waldensian refugees came in and gave them a more sensible and stable cast. They became a pious, patient people who refused to take oaths or enter military service. Then Menno Simons reorganized them. But persecution also crushed this group. Beginning with 1560 Calvinism prevailed. Pupils from Calvin's University came into Holland and spread his views everywhere.

Then for eighty years from 1568 to 1648, Spain tried to crush Holland. Charles the Fifth, of Spain, a vile monarch, carried the Inquisition to Holland, and according to Grotius the victims numbered anywhere from 30,000 to 100,000. Charles died and his son, Philip, succeeded him. In 1567 Philip sent the Duke of Alva with 10,000 soldiers, the best equipped army of the day. In three months his Council of Disturbances put to death 1,800 persons. In six years of brutual tyranny he put to death 18,000 persons, according to his own figures. The story of how the Dutch leader, William of Orange, cut the dykes that had been built after years of hard work and let in the sea to flood the land rather than surrender it to the Spainards is one of history's most thrilling episodes. There is nothing that surpasses the bravery exhibited and the hardships endured by the defenders of Leyden. ("Reed's Hist. Pres. Ch.," pages 88-91.) Finally, in 1579, the seven northern provinces were won for Protestantism. They bound themselves together and stated their principles of government in the Union of Utrecht, which is one of the noted documents of human liberty. The southern provinces remained strongly Catholic and under the rule of Spain. But by this time many had fled the country. Some went to England, and of these some came later to America. Many came here direct. Permit us to quote Dr. Wells again: "They settled New Amsterdam, now New York. They were among the earliest settlers of Maryland. Some came into the valley of Virginia, and some through Charleston into South Carolina. Many are in the Dutch Reformed Church in America, and a large number have merged into the Presbyterian Church. Fine folk they are wherever found."

Emigration From Scotland

In 1542 the Scotch Parliament enacted that it should be lawful for the people to read the Bible in their native language. In 1540 the Scotch were assisted by Queen Elizabeth, of England, in driving from their country the French troops that had been sent to coerce them into Catholicism. Of equal importance with these facts is a petition sent to the Scotch Parliament that shows the deep interest that Presbyterains had in education. They asked that church funds be divided into three equal parts and distributed one-third to the poor, one-third to ministers, and one-third to schools and colleges. It is important, too, that at this time Parliament asked the ministers to present to it a summary of doctrines that could be proved from the Bible. This work was done in four days by the six famous men whose names began with John. John Knox was one of the six. These six worthies were also asked by the Assembly of the Presbyterian Church to present to it a system of church government that could be proved from the Bible. They did this. In the year 1560 the first General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Scotland voluntarily met.

In this day when men have learned the evil that results from joining Church and State it is important to know that the church history of Scotland shows clearly that the Presbyterian Church stood for the absolute separation of Church and State. Our Church was never the national Church of Scotland. In fact it denied the authority of the king and the Parliament in church matters. At one time King James wanted to give the Church fifty-one members of Parliament. "What a temptation! Were

it proposed to give the Protestant Churches of the United States fifty-one members of Congress, how many would reason that the Church would thus be enabled to do much good, to purify legislation, to enact wholesome laws, to exalt the national legislature by an infusion of righteousness—something it sadly needs. But those Scotch Presbyterians were stalwart Christians who remembered that thus the Jews had reasoned, and had become murderously angry because Christ refused to mingle together Church and State—to become their King—had hated Him because He said, "My Kingdom is not of this world; Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's." Then, to get his measure through, the king packed the General Assembly. After a stormy debate it was passed by a majority of only ten votes. Immediately the minority filed a protest stating that the king had overawed the Assembly.

Questions for Chapter IX

1. Describe Luther's visit to Rome.
2. Who started a university in Geneva?
3. How many came the first year?
4. Who came there to be educated?
5. Where did the Swiss settle in America?
6. Who were the Huguenots?
7. Tell of the growth of this church in France.
8. Tell of the Inquisition in Holland.
9. What great leader arose?
10. What Church did the Dutch found in America?

Chapter X

The Presbyterian Church and the Revolution

In 1776 the Presbyterians and Congregationalists met in convention in Elizabeth, New Jersey, to discuss plans for insuring the religious liberty of the Churches in America. The Episcopal clergy of New York and New Jersey had petitioned for an episcopate on the ground that nearly one million of the inhabitants desired it. The Presbyterians were informed that in spite of their opposition, bishops would be appointed. In fact this religious issue was perhaps more important than any other matter connected with the Revolution. With truth it has been called a religious war. Presbyterians, Congregationalists and others were on the side of the colonies and independence, while the Episcopalians were almost without exception loyal to England.

It has been estimated that when the Revolution started there were three million people in the colonies, and that one-half or two-thirds of these were Calvinists. But this does not mean that there was such a number of Presbyterians. In fact, the number of Presbyterians was far from this figure. Many were not members of any Church. Of such, I suppose we would be correct in saying that they had been influenced by Calvinistic environment, and if they had been asked to choose a theological position, they would have leaned that way. But it was very difficult to start and maintain churches in those days. The people were widely scattered. Many settlers were far away from a church and joined the closest one without questioning

its denominational status. Many joined the Congregationalists. Some united with the Baptists. Presbyterians have always been liberal in their estimation of the worth of other Churches, and therefore many of them joined other branches of Christ's Church.

But it should be noted that the Baptists and Methodists were not very influential at this time. The Baptists have estimated their number in 1776 at 30,000. This is perhaps high. Their organizations were loose and scattered and included few educated people. The Baptists at this time were opposed to education and any who chose could enter their ministry. These things appealed strongly to the masses and gave the denomination a large growth in the closing years of the century.

In 1776 there were but six Wesleyan ministers in the colonies and all but Asbury returned to England where they shared Wesley's views of the revolt of the colonies. The Methodists have always been what might be rightly described as an emotional Church. This appealed to the masses and this Church like the Baptists enjoyed great growth immediately after the war. In the year 1790, at the last conference presided over by Wesley, it was announced that they had in America ninety-seven circuits and one hundred and ninety-eight preachers.

It is interesting to note that both the Baptists and Methodists enjoyed great growth in the early part of the nineteenth century. They multiplied very rapidly in states west of the Alleghenies. For instance, we find that in 1820 Kentucky had a white population of 434,644. But of these an amazingly small number were in the churches. This number was 46,730. It was divided as follows: Baptists, 21,680; Methodists, 20,850; Presbyterians, 3,700; oth-

ers 500. This was fifty years after the Revolution. (Figures from "Memoirs of David Rice.")

Undoubtedly the most effective forces in the success of the colonies were the Presbyterians and Congregationalists. These Churches led and were ably seconded by the Baptists. Authentic statistics state that the Presbyterian Synods of New York and Philadelphia had in 1768, or eight years before the war, ninety-eight ministers and 10,000 church members. In 1775 the number of ministers had increased to 132 in these two synods. The outstanding influence of our Church during the war is clearly shown by the fact that English officials and Tory friends placed the blame for the rebellion on the Presbyterians. There was only one Presbyterian minister who supported the British, and he was suspended by the Synod of New Jersey. Dr. Ingles, the Tory rector of the now famous Trinity Episcopal Church in New York City, wrote in 1776: "I do not know one Presbyterian minister, nor have I been able after strict inquiry to hear of any who did not, by preaching and every effort in their power, promote all the measures of the Continental Congress, however extravagant." Horace Walpole said in the British House of Commons: "There is no good in crying about the matter. America has run off with a Presbyterian parson, and that is the end of it." Six years before the war, in 1769, Peter Van Schaak wrote these very significant words: "The election in New York is ended, and the Church is triumphant in spite of all the efforts of the Presbyterians. The Presbyterians think they have as a religious body everything to dread from the power of the Church." Historians have agreed that this expressed the feelings of both sides. The Presbyterians did fear the power of the English Church, and the Eng-

lish government regarded Presbyterians as ringleaders in resistance. ("Presbyterians," by Hays, page 114.)

Presbyterians were the very backbone of the revolt. They contributed more to its successful issue than any other Church. There were many Episcopalians here in 1776 but their clergy almost to a man sided with England. There were a few notable exceptions such as Bishop White. The attitude of this Church may be shown by illustrations. Prominent among the facts is the one that General Washington, who was an Episcopalian, worshiped in Presbyterian churches during his stay in New York City.

Thirteen months before the Declaration of Independence a body of Presbyterians in Charlotte, Mecklenburg county, North Carolina, had passed their own declaration. This was dated May 31, 1775. It was a declaration of independence and also a system of local self-government to replace the English rule. This declaration stated: "All former laws are now suspended in this Province, and whatever person shall hereafter attempt to exercise any commission from the Crown shall be deemed an enemy of the country." In this convention there were nine Presbyterian elders, and most of those present were from the seven Presbyterian churches of the county. A Presbyterian elder presided, another was secretary, and a preacher made a speech. The Declaration was written by a nephew of an elder. The secretary said they took the Confession of Faith as a guide by which to prepare the system of government. Bancroft the historian was correct in saying: "The first voice publicly raised in America to dissolve all connection with Great Britain came, not from the Puritans of New England, nor the Dutch of New

York, nor the Planters of Virginia, but from the Scotch-Irish Presbyterians."

But this declaration does not stand alone. Another Presbyterian settlement of Scotch-Irish at Hannahstown in western Pennsylvania held a convention and passed similar resolutions May 16, 1776. Also, resolutions were passed in Fincastle County, Virginia, January 20, 1775. They were addressed to their delegates in the Continental Congress, and stated: "We by no means desire to shake off our duty or allegiance to our lawful Sovereign . . . so long as we can enjoy the free exercise of our religion as Protestants and our Liberties and Properties as British subjects. But if no pacific measures shall be proposed or adopted by Great Britain . . . we are deliberately and resolutely determined never to surrender them to any power upon earth, but at the expense of our lives. These are our real though unpolished sentiments of liberty and loyalty, and in them we are resolved to live and die." ("American Archives," Fourth Series, First Volume, page 1166.) It is thought that the majority, and possibly the entire committee that signed these were Presbyterians.

But Presbyterians did not content themselves with passing resolutions. They fought. Many of our preachers fought as soldiers. For this reason many of our churches were destroyed and many of our preachers became objects of revenge. Caldwell, of Elizabethtown, was shot down by a drunken assassin. Neighbors said of him that he preached and fought alternately. During the attack on Springfield the ammunition ran out and he ran into a church and brought out the hymn books and scattered them among the soldiers with the shout: "Now, boys, give them Watts." British soldiers offered a large re-

ward for his capture. Later they burned his church and shot his wife through the window of her room, and dragged her body to the street before the eyes of her children. Let Bret Harte tell the tragic story:

"Here's the spot. Look around you. Above on the height
Lay the Hessians encamped. By that church on the right
Stood the gaunt Jersey farmers. And here ran a wall.
Nothing more. Grasses spring, waters run, flowers blow
Pretty much as they did so many years ago.

"Nothing more did I say? Stay one moment; you've heard
Of Caldwell, the parson, who once preached the Word
Down at Springfield? What, no? Come, that's bad. Why, he had
All the Jerseys aflame. And they gave him the name
Of the 'rebel high priest.' He stuck in their gorge;
For he loved the Lord God, and he hated King George.

"He had cause, you may say. When the Hessians that day
Marched up with Knyphausen, they stopped on the way
At the 'Farms,' where his wife with a child in her arms,
Sat alone in the house. How it happened none knew
But God and that one of the hireling crew
Who fired the shot. Enough; there she lay,
And Caldwell, the chaplain, her husband, away.

"Did he preach? did he pray? Think of him as you stand
By the old church today; think of him and that band
Of militant plowboys. See the smoke and the heat
Of that reckless advance, of that struggling retreat;

Keep the ghost of the wife, foully slain, in your view,
And what could you, what should you, what would you
do?

"Why, just what he did. They were left in the lurch
For the want of more wadding. He ran to the church,
Broke the door, stripped the pews, and dashed out in the
road
With his arms full of hymn books, and threw down his
load
At their feet. Then above all the shouting and shots
Rang his voice: 'Put Watts into 'em; boys, give 'em
Watts.'

"And they did. That is all. Grasses, spring flowers blow
Pretty much as they did ninety-three years ago.
You may dig anywhere and you'll turn up a ball,
But not always a hero like this—and that's all."

John Rosebrough, of Allentown, New Jersey, a company chaplain, surrendered and was shot down by his captors. Others persevered through narrow escapes. Joseph Patterson knelt down to pray as the bullets shattered a board in line with his head. Others were brave. Stephen Balch preached on "Subjection to the Higher Powers," while General Williams with loaded pistols held the Royalists at bay. Others were efficient. It is said that William Tennant, of Charleston, S. C., preached in his church one hour and went the next into the State House to advocate liberty. There were many as heroic, such as McWhorter, Rodgers, McDowell, Sprat, Cooper, Allen, Allison, Patillo, Duffield, Richards, Prime and Kettletas.

The most noted Presbyterian of the Revolutionary period was Dr. John Witherspoon, a Scotchman. He had preached twenty-four years in the homeland before he came to America. In his forty-sixth year, in 1768, he was elected president of Princeton. He was a descendant of John Knox and a born leader destined to do mighty things for the colonies. The teachings and the ideals of the great Presbyterian Church helped to mold him for pre-eminence. He was one of the New Jersey delegates to the Continental Congress. It is said that when he took his seat the Declaration of Independence was being discussed. Opponents of the Declaration asked for delay that the New Jersey delegates might have time to read and discuss it, and others held strongly that the people were not ready to take such a radical step. Just at the moment when the delegates were wavering, and hesitating and halting, Witherspoon arose and turned the tide by a stirring appeal to patriotism. He said: "There is a tide in the affairs of men—a nick of time. We perceive it now before us. To hestiate is to consent to our own slavery. That noble instrument upon your table, which insures immortality to its author, should be subscribed this very morning by every pen in this house. He that will not respond to its accents and strain every nerve to carry into effect its provisions is unworthy the name of freeman. For my own part, of property I have some, of reputation more. That reputation is staked, that property is pledged, on the issue of this contest; and, although these gray hairs must soon descend into the sepulchre, I would infinitely rather that they descend thither by the hand of the executioner than desert at this crisis the sacred cause of my country." ("Presbyterianism," by Breed, page 26.)

In answer to the plea of opponents for delay Witherspoon said: "Delay is not needed on either of these grounds. The New Jersey members are familiar with the subject, and have been authorized by the convention which elected them to unite with the representatives of the other colonies in such a movement. As for the people, they are not only ripe for it but in danger of rotting for want of it." ("Presbyterians," by Hays, page 120.)

Witherspoon was the only minister in the Congress and the only minister who signed the Declaration of Independence. He was in Congress for six years. He was the intimate friend of Robert Morris, the financier of the Revolutionary government. In the dark days when Washington's army was forced to retreat through New Jersey and Congress moved from Philadelphia to Baltimore Witherspoon, John Adams and Richard Henry Lee sent forth a stirring appeal never to give up but make greater efforts. Witherspoon wrote the appeal. He was on the Board of War, a member of the Committee on Finances, a member of the Committee on the State of Money and Finances of the United States, a member of the Committee on Treatment of Prisoners, a member of the Committee on Supplying the Army by Commission, and a member of the Secret Committee on the Conduct of the War. It is doubtful if a Presbyterian minister ever exerted more influence at a crucial political time than did Dr. Witherspoon during the stirring days of the Revolution.

A Baptist writer says: "Dexter in his monumental work on Congregationalism, quotes from Belcher the statement that Jefferson considered Baptist denominational government the only form of pure democracy which then

existed in the world and concluded eight or ten years before the American Revolution, that this would be the best plan of government for the American colonies." ("Christ in Creation," page 242.) But the government of the United States has never been like that of the Baptist denomination but like that of the Presbyterian. This is not a democracy but a republic. Mr. Jefferson doubtless, as all right minded people, respected and admired the freedom of the Baptist denomination, but this form of government is not sufficient for a great country like this.

Mr. Jefferson said that he did not hear of the Mecklenburg Declaration before writing the Declaration of Independence and was not influenced by it. But Mr. Jefferson states a fact that affords a possible explanation of why this Declaration never reached the Continental Congress. He has written: "Hooper was a great Tory. Hughes was very wavering, sometimes firm, sometimes feeble, so that he had to be held up to his duty by Caswell the other delegate, who soon left for home." ("Presbyterians," by Hays, page 128.) The Mecklenburg Declaration was entrusted to one Captain Jack, who carried it to Philadelphia and perhaps put it in the hands of one of these delegates, who carefully pocketed it as a rash action that should be kept secret lest it bring down the wrath of the British upon the heads of all.

There is authority for the fact that a committee took the Declaration to Congress, and the President of Congress "returned a polite answer to the address, which accompanied the resolutions, but deemed the subject of the resolutions premature to be laid before Congress." The three congressional delegates wrote a joint letter, complimenting the people of Mecklenburg for their zeal, urged them

to be orderly, and stated that the time would come when the colonies would follow their example.

A great controversy has raged around this declaration. First, because it bestows great honor upon its signers. Second, it has been said that Jefferson was deeply indebted to and guided by it. Jefferson's friends came to his defense and tried to belittle the declaration and overthrow it, but the discovery of evidence now seems to uphold the historical accuracy and worth of the declaration. (A very fine article reviewing the evidence will be found in the "North American Review," July, 1906, page 47.)

It is worth noting that the members of the Constitutional Convention, held in Philadelphia in 1787, had numerous opportunities to learn the form of government of the Presbyterian Church and the views of our people on the separation of Church and State. Hanover Presbytery in Eastern Virginia made in the fall of 1776 to the first Assembly of Virginia the first and fullest statement of religious liberty made by an ecclesiastical body in America. Washington is supposed to have known of the principles of this people as indicated by a declaration he is said to have made to the effect that if he was defeated and had but one standard left he would plant it on the Blue Ridge, and making that his Thermopylae rally around him the patriots of the valley and there found a republic. Such a tribute to those of Virginia and Carolina sounds most reasonable and was certainly merited. Washington probably knew of the Mecklenburg Declaration and certainly knew the spirit of these people.

Winson has written these strong words: "The only organized and official measures taken by any one of the religious denominations in sympathy with the American

Revolution was that of the Presbyterians, who had freed themselves from dependence on a civil establishment. The Scotch-Irish Presbyterians on the frontiers of Virginia and North Carolina had stoutly vindicated their religious rights against the Established Church in Virginia and were among the foremost in asserting their independence of the mother country. With the sturdiest resolution they had successfully triumphed over the Episcopal party in New York and thwarted government influence in its behalf. John Witherspoon, the only clergyman in the Congress of 1776, gave by delegated authority the vote of the Presbyterians for independence." ("Narrative and Critical History," Vol. VI, page 244.)

The three leaders of the Constitutional Convention were Washington, Madison and Hamilton. Washington had held numerous conferences with Dr. Rodgers, a Presbyterian minister of New York, during the former's stay in that vicinity. For six years Washington was associated with Dr. Witherspoon in Congress. Besides these he had received great help from Presbyterians on the battlefields.

Fighting Presbyterians

It has been said that the turning point in the Revolution was given by the battle of the Cowpens, that of King's Mountain, and the severe skirmish known as Huck's Defeat. In the battle of the Cowpens, General Morgan, a Presbyterian elder, was in command, while General Pickens, another Presbyterian elder, made the plans and arrangements for the fight. Nearly all the troops under them were Presbyterians. At the battle of King's Mountain the colonels were Presbyterians, and the large part of their soldiers were from Presbyterian settle-

ments. The names of the colonels were: Sevier, Shelby, Williams, Campbell, Cleveland, "Huck's Defeat" fought in York County, S. C., near Col. Bratton's home, about 25 miles from King's Mountain Battleground.—[*F. W. G.*] —and Colonel Bratton and Major Dickson were both Presbyterian elders. Major Samuel Morrow, another noted soldier who was with Colonel Sumter in four engagements and who took part in numerous other battles, was a Presbyterian elder for about fifty years. We cannot begin to tell the history of those who, like General Marion, were of Huguenot or Scotch-Irish blood, and thus imbued with Presbyterian ideas and teachings.

Madison and Hamilton

We have spoken briefly of Washington and of the three recognized leaders of the Constitutional Convention, and we will now add a few words about Madison and Hamilton. Madison had attended Princeton at the time that Dr. Witherspoon was president of that institution and had graduated. Certainly, all will admit that he must have been deeply influenced by this great man, and that he was somewhat molded by Presbyterianism. Madison was an Episcopalian, but his career indicates that much of the democracy and liberty of the Presbyterian Church was in him.

When Alexander Hamilton was sixteen years old he was examined by Dr. Witherspoon for entrance to Princeton, and the scholar complimented the youth on his marked ability. But Hamilton did not enter Princeton. He wished to avoid spending four years in taking the required course, and when his request to study the sub-

jects required, master them, and pass examinations on them as rapidly as he could, and thus save perhaps two years, was refused he went to what is now Columbia University. But Hamilton's father was a Scotchman and his mother was a Huguenot. His parents died while he was young and a Presbyterian minister of Jamaica, New York, became his tutor. Later he married the daughter of a Dutch Reformed layman. This Church is like the Presbyterian and is one branch of our great family. To these facts should be added the significant statement: "Dr. Alexander McGill, of Princeton, is authority for the statement from Mrs. Hamilton that, when they were residing in Philadelphia during the Constitutional Convention, General Hamilton kept the Presbyterian Form of Government on his study table." ("Hays," page 134.) In consideration of these facts and the additional one that nine Princeton graduates were in the convention, it is certainly not too much for us to claim that the writers of the Constitution were influenced by the Presbyterian Church. In fact no other Church can claim such a close relation to this great document.

Such then is an outline of the part of the great Presbyterian Church in colonial days. Few Churches, if any, can match this glorious history. We do not know of another Church whose record is studded with as many high and creditable jewels. Ought we not to be proud of it and thank God for the worthy ancestors who preceded us?

Questions for Chapter X

1. What religious issue arose in 1776?
2. How many people were in the colonies in 1776?
3. What proportion was Calvinistic?
4. Why were they not in churches?
5. Who was blamed for causing the war?
6. Which is the most striking comment—Ingles', Walpole's, or Von Schaak's?
7. Where were resolutions in favor of independence passed previous to the opening of the war?
8. Who was the most noted Presbyterian preacher of the period?
9. Describe Witherspoon's activities.
10. What church government is like that of our country?
11. Tell of the fighting Presbyterians.
12. Describe influence of our Church on Washington, Madison and Hamilton.

Chapter XI

Thirty-five Reasons Why I Prefer the Presbyterian Church

1. The Bible is its only rule of faith and practice.

2. It is not afraid of any part of the Bible, and faces all the teachings that are in it.

3. It has a scholarly creed that is supported by proof-texts from the Bible. Six books make up the Westminster Standards. They are:

I. The Confession of Faith, with thirty-three chapters, that tells in lofty and clear language the doctrines of the Bible.

II. The Larger Cathechism. It is arranged in the form of questions and answers and covers in fewer words the things taught in the Confession.

III. The Westminster Shorter Catechism has 107 brief questions and answers. This is a marvelous outline of doctrine.

IV. The Form of Government. It tells how the local church shall be organized and governed, how the various courts of the Church—the session, Presbytery, Synod and Assembly are related and how ministers and officers shall be ordained, installed and transferred.

V. The Book of Discipline. It prescribes the laws governing discipline in the church courts. It tells the laws governing trials, censures, judgments, appeals and complaints.

VI. The Directory of Worship. No compulsory forms are given but the minister is directed how to conduct baptisms, marriage ceremonies, communion and worship.

4. The Creed exhibits scholarship, biblical truth and logical exegesis.

5. Its doctrine exalts the sovereignty of God, the heinousness of sin, and salvation by grace and through faith in Christ alone.

6. It gives its members a full share in governing the Church.

7. By letting men govern their churches, it teaches them to govern themselves.

8. It has a system of courts that bar mob troubles, protect rights, and settle difficulties in a dignified way.

9. Our system of government is midway between the two extremes of Congregationalism and Episcopacy. Episcopacy tends to monarchy while Congregationalism is pure democracy which is an impossible form of government for large and world-wide Churches. The Baptists have been forced to imitate Presbyterianism in forming associations and state conventions.

10. We think the Presbyterian Church represents the biblical and therefore the correct view of Church government.

11. The Presbyterian Church has been the friend of liberty and the foe of oppression.

12. It stands absolutely for the separation of Church and State.

13. It brings pastors and people together.

14. It is not narrow and accords other Churches the right to exist. It recognizes the baptism of other Churches and receives members by letter from all evangelical bodies that believe in Jesus Christ as the Son of God.

15. It recognizes other denominations as brothers.

16. And for this reason it is the best friend of other denominations.

17. Liberality on the mode of baptism and other points is in accord with advanced scholarship.

18. Its interpretation of the sacraments is high and logical. Baptism represents the outpouring of the Holy Spirit.

19. It exalts the value of piety above sacraments. Some Churches have unintentionally taught that sacraments are more important than a holy life.

20. It has the most glorious history of all the Churches. It is shown by the effect of Presbyterian principles upon Switzerland, France, Scotland, England, Holland and America. There has been far less fanaticism in its history than in that of any other great Church.

21. Our Church has no fanatical element in it. Church history describes fanatical sects. But Presbyterianism has not produced Baptismal Regenerationists or Holy Rollers. This has been because the churches in the wilderness enjoy preaching as biblical as that enjoyed by town churches. Presbyterian preachers are alike no matter where found.

22. Our Church has had and has today a strong ministry.

23. Our Church stresses education. Dutch Presbyterians were the fathers of free schools.

24. Our creed guides our people to an adequate and accurate knowledge of the Bible. If you ask a Presbyterian what is God, or what is sin, or what is grace, he can answer or should be able to.

25. Our Church asks of those who seek membership in it only very simple questions. Such do not subscribe to the creed. It is for ministers and elders and deacons.

26. Our Church emphasizes a great creed, a system of government, education, a strong ministry, and the dignity of the individual. Each great Church has made its contribution.

The Methodists placed a definite emphasis on Christian experience. They taught that every man should have an experimental knowledge in his conversion. At its birth England was dead in formalism. A great subject with the Methodists has been the new birth.

The Disciples Church was organized to promote unity. This they hoped to do by holding to the New Testament as their creed with the idea that all might agree upon it.

The Baptist denomination emphasized obedience to Christ, and preached that people should follow Him in baptism. It has also emphasized liberty and the democratic form of church government.

The Episcopal Church has emphasized liturgy. Its prayer book is beautiful and worshipful.

What has the Presbyterian Church contributed? (1) The greatest creed ever written. The depths and mysteries are beyond the human mind but according to God's Word. (2) A system of government. That of the United States is like it. (3) Education has been one of our principal tenets. Now all Churches emphasize it. For a long time Presbyterians were the only ones to do so. (4) A strong ministry. (5) Liberty and dignity of the individual. Monarchy and Presbytery never went harmoniously together.

27. All Presbyterian Churches have been interested in foreign missions. The Southern Presbyterian Church had 498 missionaries in 1928. This is one for every 897 members. The Southern Baptists, with about three and one-half million members, had less than 600 missionaries, or one for every 6,000 members. The Southern Methodists, with about two and one-half million members, are sending out one missionary for every 5,000 church members. The U. S. A. Presbyterian Church sends out over 1,800 foreign missionaries. In 1926, five Presbyterian bodies in America were sending out 2,943 foreign missionaries at a cost of $8,566,886. The Presbyterian Church membership on the foreign field in 1926 was 334,623.

28. Many of the largest and most influential churches in our land are Presbyterian. The First church, of Seattle, has 7,886 members. The U. S. A. Presbyterian Church has over 200 congregations with 1,000 or more members each. Philadelphia has thirteen, and Detroit ten churches of over 1,000 members each.

29. The Alliance of the Reformed Churches Throughout the World Holding the Presbyterian System has 106 Presbyterian denominations, with 9,613,940 members, and the present constituency is about fifty millions.

30. In America, nine Presidents of the United States have been of Presbyterian faith or inclined thereto. Two of these were Dutch Reformed. Two, Cleveland and Wilson, were sons of Presbyterian ministers. Two were elders, Harrison for forty years and Wilson for twenty-five years. A majority of all the Presidents were either educated in Presbyterian institutions or married into Presbyterian families.

31. Presbyterians are a liberal people. There are in America 9,119,575 Methodists. Baptists number 8,712,607. Presbyterians 3,292,610. Lutherans 2,656,158. Disciples of Christ 1,799,313.

The Presbyterians are in five bodies as follows:

U. S. A. (Northern)	1,962,838
U. S. (Southern)	444,657
Reformed U. S.	349,711
United	238,240
Reformed A. (Dutch)	151,281
Other Bodies	145,883

In 1926 these five bodies gave to all causes $90,059,929. The twenty-two million church members of America gave $463,871,678. Thus Presbyterians with one-seventh the membership gave one-fifth of the money.

32. The Presbyterian Church is world-wide. Three-fourths of all the Baptists in the world are in the southern part of the United States. Baptists have not flourished in cold climates. But our Church is world-wide. In some countries it was once strong but persecution forced it out. England would be Presbyterian today had not persecution interfered.

33. The founders of the Presbyterian Church won the Reformation.

34. The founders of the Presbyterian Church broke the backbone of royalty and made the triumph of liberty possible.

35. The founders of the Presbyterian Church laid the foundations of America.

Questions for Chapter XI

1. What has our Church contributed to American life?
2. How many members has our Church?
3. How many Presbyterians are there in the world?
4. What is the difference between membership and constituency?
5. Write from memory the reasons why you prefer the Presbyterian Church.

Princeton Theological Seminary Libraries
1 1012 01236 0659

Date Due

JA 3 - '56
N 26 '42
My - 1 '45
MAR 28 '61
N 31 '45
MAY 8
Ap 22 '46
JUL 7 '61
Ag 12 '46
MAR 8
JUL 2 '75
N 4 '46
MAR 31
JE 7 - '48
DE 27 '48
MY 30 '49
FACULTY
MR 16 '51
AP 3 - '52
FACULTY
MY 27 '54
FE 7 - '55